arXiv:1610.08565v1 [math.AP] 26 Oct 2016

SOBOLEV REGULARITY FOR SYMMETRIC–CONVEX FUNCTIONALS

FRANZ GMEINEDER AND JAN KRISTENSEN

Abstract. We study Sobolev regularity results for minimisers of autonomous, convex variational of linear growth which depend on the symmetric gradient rather than the full gradient. This extends the results available in the literature for the BV–setting to the case of functionals whose full gradients are a priori not known to exist as matrix–valued Radon measures.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Setup 5
3. An Embedding for BD ∩ BMO 11
4. Viscosity Approximations 14
5. Appendix 28
References 32

1. Introduction

In this work we study the regularity of minimisers of autonomous variational integrals of the form

$$\mathfrak{F}[u] := \int_\Omega f(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u))\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{1.1}$$

with an open and bounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ subject to suitable Dirichlet boundary conditions. Here, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) := \frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{D}u + \mathrm{D}^{\mathsf{T}}u)$ denotes the *symmetric gradient* and $f \in \mathrm{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ is a variational integrand of *linear growth*. By this we understand that there exist two constants $0 < c_0 \leq c_1 < \infty$ such that

$$c_0|\boldsymbol{\xi}| \leq f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq c_1(1+|\boldsymbol{\xi}|) \tag{1.2}$$

holds for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$. Due to growth condition (1.2), the functional $\mathfrak{F}$ is well–defined on the Sobolev space $\mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Imitating the approach pursued in the minimal surface case, specifying an appropriate Dirichlet class within which the above minimization problem has to be considered, non–reflexivity of $\mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ suggests that minimizers of $\mathfrak{F}$ are attained in the space $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ of functions of bounded variation; that is, those elements of $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$ whose distributional gradients are Radon measures of finite total variation on Ω. However, due to Ornstein's Non–Inequality [26, 24, 14], there is no constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |\,\mathrm{D}u|\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)|\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{1.3}$$

holds for all $u \in \mathrm{C}^1_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and so neither $\mathfrak{F}$ nor a suitable relaxation is coercive on $\mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ or $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$, respectively. Basically, the non–validity of estimates (1.3) is a consequence of unboundedness of singular integral operators on L^1. In this context, the appropriate substitutes are given by the spaces $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ which consist of all $u \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ for which the distributional symmetric gradients $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)$ belong to $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ or can be represented by $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$–valued finite Radon measures on Ω, respectively; see section 2.2. In particular, Ornstein's Non–Inequality then implies that in general $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \subsetneq \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ and that the *full* distributional gradients of BD–functions might not even exist as measures. Hence the chief question which we shall treat in the present work is to find conditions on the variational integrand $f \in \mathrm{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}};\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ such that minimisers indeed qualify as elements of $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ or Sobolev spaces $\mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$.

1.1. **Generalised Minimisers.** To define the concept of minimisers we shall work with, firstly note that $\mathfrak{F}$ given by (1.1) is merely defined for $u \in \mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ and so must be relaxed to be defined for $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$. Here, because f is autonomous and convex, it is irrelevant whether we choose the weak*– or L^1–relaxation; indeed, they coincide in this case. To be more precise, we consider the variational principle

$$\text{to minimise } \ \mathfrak{F} \ \text{ within a Dirichlet class } \mathscr{D}_{u_0} := u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega), \tag{1.4}$$

where $\mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)$ is the closure of $\mathrm{C}^1_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ with respect to $\|v\|_{\mathrm{LD}} := \|v\|_{\mathrm{L}^1} + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(v)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1}$ and $u_0 \in \mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, note because the trace operator maps $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ surjectively onto $\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathscr{H}^{n-1}}(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see section 2.2), which is the case for $\mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ too due to a result of Gagliardo, considering the Dirichlet classes $\mathscr{D}_{u_0}$ with $u_0 \in \mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ in fact makes sense.

To give an alternative description of minima of such relaxed functionals, we follow Bildhauer [8] and define the set of *generalised minimisers* of $\mathfrak{F}$ by

$$\mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F}) := \left\{ u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega) \colon \begin{array}{c} u \text{ is the } \mathrm{L}^1\text{-limit of an } \mathfrak{F}\text{-minimising} \\ \text{sequence } (u_k) \subset u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{1.5}$$

This definition explicitely makes use of L^1–convergence which, in turn, is motivated by a a standard compactness result for $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$; namely, if a sequence $(u_k) \subset \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ is norm bounded, then there exists a subsequence converging strongly in $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ (recall that $\partial\Omega$ is assumed to be Lipschitz). Let us now define the *recession function* f^∞ associated with f by

$$f^\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \lim_{t\searrow 0} t f\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}}{t}\right), \qquad \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}. \tag{1.6}$$

Using convexity and linear growth of f, it is easy to show that f^∞ is well–defined and convex too. Let $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ and split $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) = \mathrm{E}^a u + \mathrm{E}^s u$ into its absolutely continuous and singular parts with respect to $\mathscr{L}^n$. Then we put

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u] := \int_\Omega f(\mathrm{E}^a u)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega f^\infty\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathrm{E}^s u}{\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u| \\ + \int_{\partial\Omega} f^\infty\big((\mathrm{Tr}(u) - \mathrm{Tr}(u_0)) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

where as usual $\mathrm{d}\mathrm{E}^s u/\,\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u|$ denotes the Lebesgue density of $\mathrm{E}^s u$ with respect to its total variation measure $|\,\mathrm{E}^s u|$ and $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$ (see section 2.2 for more on notation). As can be easily shown, $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ is a generalised minimiser for $\mathfrak{F}$ if and only if it is $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$–minimising; also compare section 5.1.

Let us note that by definition, f^∞ is positively 1–homogeneous and thus not strictly convex regardless of strict convexity of f. As a consequence, strict convexity of f does not suffice to immediately deduce uniqueness of generalised minimisers. Thus, when applying the vanishing viscosity method in order to establish regularity results for generalised minimisers, we only cover one particular generalised minimiser; others, possessing symmetric

gradients with a different singular part with resect to Lebesgue measure, might exhibit different behaviour.

The decisive feature of integrands f for variational integrals (1.1) to produce minimisers of higher Sobolev regularity is that of μ–ellipticity, to be discussed next.

1.2. **μ–elliptic Integrands.** Throughout the present work we shall further assume that $f \in \mathrm{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}};\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is a *μ–elliptic* (and thus, in particular, convex) integrand. This notion of ellipticity originates from a series of papers by Bildhauer & Fuchs [8, 10] in their study of minimisation problems of the type (1.1), where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ was replaced by the full gradients and which we recall here for completeness:

Definition 1.1 (μ–ellipticity)**.** *Let $1 < \mu \leq 3$. A C^2–integrand $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called* μ–elliptic *if and only if there exist $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$ such that*

$$\lambda \frac{|\mathbf{A}|^2}{(1+|\mathbf{B}|^2)^{\frac{\mu}{2}}} \leq \langle f''(\mathbf{B})\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}\rangle \leq \Lambda \frac{|\mathbf{A}|^2}{(1+|\mathbf{B}|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{1.8}$$

holds for all $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$.

As a direct consequence of the definition, μ–elliptic integrands are automatically strongly convex. In particular, we have uniform control on the ellipticity ratio

$$\mathbf{A} \mapsto \frac{\text{largest eigenvalue of } f''(\mathbf{A})}{\text{smallest eigenvalue of } f''(\mathbf{A})}, \qquad \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$$

of the variational integrands which in turn is necessary to establish higher Sobolev regularity of minima. Important examples of μ–elliptic integrands are given by smoothed versions of the area–type integrands

$$m_p(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := (1+|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$$

with $\mu = p+1$. Another class of examples is provided by the one–parameter family of integrands $\{\varphi_\mu\}$, $\mu > 1$, given by

$$\varphi_\mu(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \int_0^{|\boldsymbol{\xi}|} \int_0^s \left(1+t^2\right)^{-\frac{\mu}{2}} \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s, \qquad \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}.$$

Then, as shown in [8], Examples 3.9 and 4.17, each φ_μ is μ–elliptic. Moreover, for $\mu = 3$ we reobtain the usual area integrand $\langle\cdot\rangle := m_2$, whereas $\mu = 2$ precisely gives $\varphi_2(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := |\boldsymbol{\xi}|\arctan(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|) - \frac{1}{2}\log(1+|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2)$, $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. As we shall see below, $\mu = 2$ is precisely the borderline case which can be dealt with using the method developed in this paper and hence is of special interest to us.

Let us further note that in the definition of μ–ellipticity the case $\mu = 1$ is explicitely excluded. Indeed, it is easy to show that 1–elliptic C^2–integrands are of $L\log L$–growth and hence beyond the scope of integrands of linear growth. Moreover, since singular integrals of convolution type map $L\log L(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$, minimisers of (1.1) with 1–elliptic f possess full distributional gradients in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$. In consequence, when studying regularity properties of such minima, we may directly test with the full difference quotients and hence no modification of the common difference quotient method is required.

1.3. **Main Results.** The main obstruction in deriving a higher differentiability result for functionals of the type (1.1) under the linear growth assumption on f is that, by Ornstein's Non–Inequality, the full distributional gradients of BD–functions do not need to exist as Radon measures of finite total mass. Since the failure of Korn's inequality in the linear growth setting is mainly due to the unboundedness of singular integrals of convolution type on L^1 (see Remark 2.1), we shall reduce to a setup in which we can fruitfully employ boundedness of singular integrals. More precisely, using μ–ellipticity of the integrands and employing a difference quotient–type technique, we will shift the higher differentiability issue to suitable weighted Lebesgue spaces with integrability exponents $p > 1$. Here, the Muckenhoupt A_p–classes play an instrumental role since they precisely consist of those

weights for which singular integrals are bounded between the corresponding weighted L^p–spaces.

As mentioned above, another difficulty stems from the fact that the symmetric gradients of generalised minimisers are not a priori known to be absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathscr{L}^n$. Consequently, since we are not allowed uniqueness of generalised minima, a stabilisation procedure relying on the vanishing viscosity approach must be suitably modified. In doing so, we follow essentially the lines of Beck & Schmidt [7] and, starting from a given generalised minimiser, thus construct a specific minimising sequence that weak*–converges to the generalised minimiser so that each of its members almost minimises an appropriately stabilised functional. Since this sequence belongs to LD, we are further in position to avoid manipulations on difference quotient of measures. In constructing the aforementioned specific minimising sequence, we make use of the Ekeland variational principle, however, unlike in [7], where the authors worked in the negative Sobolev space $\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}$, we employ it in the dual space $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*$ in order to obtain perturbations that are weak enough to be dealt with the available a priori–estimates.

The core of our approach, however, consists in considering finite differences instead of the full difference quotients. This is a necessary requirement since we do not have a priori control over the full difference quotients, and canonically leads to the derivation of Nikolskiĭ–type estimates of the symmetric gradients of generalised minima. Recalling that we wish to use the machinery of singular integrals on weighted L^p–spaces, we will shift a certain part of the degeneracy of f'' into weights which, by the classical Coifman–Rochberg lemma from harmonic analysis, leads to the restriction $1<\mu<2$ for the weights to belong to the correct Muckenhoupt classes. Our main result then reads as follows:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f\in \mathrm{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ be a convex integrand of linear growth and Ω an open and bounded Lipschitz subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. For every $n\in\mathbb{N}$ with $n\geq 2$ there exists a number $1<\mu(n)<2$ and an exponent $p\geq 1$ such that the following holds: If f is μ–elliptic with $\mu\leq\mu(n)$, then any generalised minimiser $u\in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)\cap \mathrm{BMO}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ of the functional (1.1) belongs to $\mathrm{W}^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

As a byproduct of our proof, we obtain that the solution $\sigma\in \mathrm{L}^\infty_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ of the dual problem (in the sense of convex duality) actually belongs to $\mathrm{W}^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$. Indeed, the dual problem is substantially better behaved than the primal one: Whereas the recession part of the relaxed primal functional might lead to non–uniqueness for generalised minimisers provided a too weak ellipticity is assumed for f, the dual solution is always unique and enjoys the aforementioned higher Sobolev regularity. However, unlike elliptic variationals of p–growth, $p>1$, in our case we may not assume that $\sigma=f'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u))$, where $u\colon\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^n$ is a generalised minimiser. In fact, this would be the case if we knew a priori that $u\in\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$, in turn being equivalent to $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_\infty(\{\sigma\in\partial\mathrm{dom}(f^*)\})=0$ (where f^* is the Fenchel conjugate of f and $\mathrm{dom}(f^*)$ its effective domain), but this is not clear at the relevant stage of the proof.

A consequence of Theorem 1.2 is the following result on the uniqueness of generalised minimisers. Similarly to functionals of linear growth depending on the gradient (see [7], section 5), uniqueness of generalised minimisers only can be obtained modulo rigid deformations, that is, elements of the nullspace of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$:

Theorem 1.3 (Uniqueness)**.** *Let $f\colon\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}\to\mathbb{R}$ be a μ–elliptic integrand of linear growth with $\mu\leq\mu(n)$, where $\mu(n)$ is given by Theorem 1.2. Suppose that Ω is an open, bounded and connected Lipschitz subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then any two generalised minimisers $u,v\in\mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F})\cap\mathrm{BMO}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ differ by a rigid deformation, that is, there exists $R\in\mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ such that $u=v+R$ holds $\mathscr{L}^n$–a.e. in Ω.*

To conclude with, let us highlight that our method (which can be applied to functionals of linear growth depending on the full gradient equally well) allows to drop the local boundedness assumption of the generalised minimisers, which seemed to be an instrumental ingredient in the Sobolev regularity results to be found in the literature [8, 10, 7].

Indeed, as Theorem 1.2 shows, a local BMO–bound indeed suffices, and it is likely that this can even be weakened further. However, since this is not the focal point of the present inquiry, we shall defer this point to future work.

1.4. **Organisation of the Paper.** In section 2 we fix notation and collect some important definitions and preliminary facts, in particular, concerning functions of bounded deformation and weighted Besov spaces. Before we embark on the proof of the main results of this work in section 4, we provide in section 3 an embedding result for $\mathrm{BMO}\cap\mathrm{BD}$ that uses a mean–value characterisation of fractional differentiablity established by Dorronsoro [18]. Finally, the appendix contains auxiliary material as to relaxation and the treatment of the Dirichlet problem on BD and records background information on Besov spaces.

2. Setup

In this section we fix notation, record important definitions and collect some preliminary results to be used in the main part.

2.1. **General Notation.** Unless stated otherwise, we assume Ω to be an open and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$. Given $x_0\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and $r>0$, we denote $\mathrm{B}(x_0,r):=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n\colon |x-x_0|<r\}$ the open ball with radius r centered at x_0. The n–dimensional Lebesgue measure is denoted $\mathscr{L}^n$ and the $(n-1)$–dimensional Hausdorff measure is denoted $\mathscr{H}^{n-1}$. Given two positive, real valued functions f,g, we indicate by $f\lesssim g$ that $f\le Cg$ with a constant $C>0$. If $f\lesssim g$ and $g\lesssim f$, we write $f\approx g$. If $U\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ is measurable with $\mathscr{L}^n(U)>0$ and $f\in\mathrm{L}^1(U;\mathbb{R}^N)$, we put as usual

$$(f)_U:=\fint_U f\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^n:=\frac{1}{\mathscr{L}^n(U)}\int_U f\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^n.$$

For a given measurable function $f\colon\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$, a unit vector e_s, $s=1,...,n$, and a stepwidth $h\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$, we define the *forward finite difference* $\tau^+_{s,h}f(x)$ and the *backward finite difference* $\tau^-_{s,h}$, respectively, by

$$\tau^+_{s,h}f(x):=f(x+he_s)-f(x),\quad \tau^-_{s,h}f(x):=f(x-he_s)-f(x)$$

for all $x\in\Omega$ with $\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)>h$. Moreover, for such x we put

$$\Delta_{s,h}f(x):=\Delta^+_{s,h}f(x):=\frac{\tau^+_{s,h}f(x)}{h},\quad \Delta^-_{s,h}f(x):=\frac{\tau^-_{s,h}f(x)}{h}.$$

Finally, we denote by $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ the symmetric $n\times n$–matrices with real entries and, given $u,v\in\mathbb{R}^n$, we denote their dyadic product $u\otimes v:=uv^{\mathsf{T}}$ and their symmetric dyadic product $u\otimes_{\mathrm{sym}}v:=\frac12(u\otimes v+v\otimes u)$.

2.2. **Functions of Bounded Deformation.** Here we recall the space of functions of bounded deformation as introduced in [13, 33]. For more detailled background information, the reader is referred to [1, 32, 6, 21]. Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ be open. A measurable function $u\colon\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^n$ belongs to $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ if and only if $u\in\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and its *total deformation*

$$|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)|(\Omega):=\sup\Big\{\int_\Omega v\cdot\operatorname{div}(\varphi)\,\mathrm{d}x\colon\ \varphi\in\mathrm{C}^1_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}),\|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})}\le1\Big\}. \tag{2.1}$$

is finite, where the divergence has to be understood row–wise. The norm on $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ is given by $\|u\|_{\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)}:=\|u\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)|(\Omega)$, and endowed with this norm, $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space. Since the norm topology is too strong for most applications, it is useful to consider the following convergences instead: We say that a sequence $(u_k)\subset\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ converges to $u\in\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ in the *weak*–sense* provided $u_k\to u$ strongly in $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)$ in the sense of $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$–valued measures as $k\to\infty$. Moreover, if (u_k) converges to u in the weak*–sense and $|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|(\Omega)\to|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)|(\Omega)$ as $k\to\infty$, then we say

that (u_k) converges *strictly* to u as $k \to \infty$. Lastly, we say that (u_k) converges to u in the *area–strict sense* provided $u_k \to u$ strictly and

$$\sqrt{1+|\mathrm{E}u_k|^2}(\Omega) \to \sqrt{1+|\mathrm{E}u|^2}(\Omega) \qquad \text{as } k \to \infty.$$

The concept of applying convex functions (so, e.g., the area integrand $\sqrt{1+|\cdot|^2}$) to a measure as utilised here will be carefully explained in section 5.1.1 below.

Resembling the fact that $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ arises as the weak*–closure of $\mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ is the weak*–closure of the space

$$\mathrm{LD}(\Omega) := \big\{u \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)\colon\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})\big\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)$ is the distributional symmetric gradient, and the norm on $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ is given by $\|u\|_{\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}$. We further put

$$\mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega) := \overline{\mathrm{C}^1_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)}}.$$

The claimed property that $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ is the weak*–closure of $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ follows from the fact that $(\mathrm{LD}\cap\mathrm{C}^\infty)(\Omega)$ is dense in $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ with respect to strict convergence, see [AG]. Moreover, if Ω is a bounded Lipschitz subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, then there exists a

- surjective trace operator $\mathrm{Tr}\colon \mathrm{LD}(\Omega) \to \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathscr{H}^{n-1}}(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ which is continuous with respect to the LD–norm;
- surjective trace operator $\mathrm{Tr}\colon \mathrm{BD}(\Omega) \to \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathscr{H}^{n-1}}(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ which is continuous with respect to strict convergence.

Given $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ and splitting the symmetric gradient measure $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)$ into its absolutely continuous and singular part with respect to Lebesgue measure, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) = \mathrm{E}^a u + \mathrm{E}^s u$, the above trace theorem can be employed to establish

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) = \mathrm{E}^a u + \mathrm{E}^s u =: \mathscr{E}u\mathscr{L}^n + \mathrm{E}^s u = \mathscr{E}u\mathscr{L}^n + \mathrm{E}^s u\llcorner\Omega + (\mathrm{Tr}(u)\odot\nu_{\partial\Omega})\mathscr{H}^{n-1}\llcorner\partial\Omega,$$

where $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ is the outward unit normal to the boundary of the Lipschitz set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$; see [4, 32, 6] for more information on the trace operator and the relevant Gauss–Green formulas.

By Ornstein's Non–Inequality, we have $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega) \not\hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and thus $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega) \not\hookrightarrow \mathrm{BV}(\Omega)$ also. However, some additional information is available when passing to fractional spaces. We recall that, given $1 \le p < \infty$ and $0 < s < 1$, a measurable function $u\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^N$ belongs to the fractional Sobolev space $\mathrm{W}^{s,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ if and only if $u \in \mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$[u]^p_{\mathrm{W}^{s,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)} := \iint_{\Omega\times\Omega} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{n+sp}}\,\mathrm{d}(x,y) < \infty.$$

Invoking the fractional Sobolev spaces, we have that both $\mathrm{LD}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{BD}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ continuously embed into $\mathrm{W}^{s,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $0 < s < 1$; see Proposition 2.2 below. For the sake of clarity of exposition, we shall sketch its proof below, however, note that the result itself can be strengthened using Van Schaftingen's general theory of cancelling operators (Lemma 3.4).

These statements in turn rest on the *Smith representation formula* [28]: Given $u = (u^1,\dots,u^n) \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$, we may write

$$u^k = \frac{2}{n\omega_n}\sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 u^k}{\partial x_j\partial x_j} * K_{ij}, \qquad \text{where } K_{ij}(x) = \frac{x_i x_j}{|x|^n} \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Setting $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) := (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)_{jk})_{jk}$, we observe that

$$\frac{\partial^2 u^k}{\partial x_i\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)_{jk}}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)_{ij}}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)_{ki}}{\partial x_j}$$

and hence, inserting this relation into (2.3), we obtain after an integration by parts

$$u^k = \frac{2}{n\omega_n} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \big(\varepsilon(u)_{jk} * \frac{\partial K_{ij}}{\partial x_i} - \varepsilon(u)_{ij} * \frac{\partial K_{ij}}{\partial x_k} + \varepsilon(u)_{ki} * \frac{\partial K_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \big) \tag{2.4}$$

for all $k = 1, ..., n$. To briefly justify the preceding formula through use of Fourier analysis, let us recall a first order constant coefficient, linear and homogeneous differential operator between two finite dimensional vector spaces V and E can be written in the form

$$\mathbb{A} := \sum_{|\alpha|=1} \mathbb{A}_\alpha \partial^\alpha, \tag{2.5}$$

where the $\mathbb{A}_\alpha \in \mathscr{L}(V, E)$, $|\alpha| = 1$, are fixed homomorphisms. In this situation, we say that $\mathbb{A}$ is *elliptic* provided its *symbol map*

$$\mathbb{A}[\xi] := \sum_{|\alpha|=1} \xi_\alpha \mathbb{A}_\alpha, \qquad \xi = (\xi_1, ..., \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

is an injective mapping $\mathbb{A}[\xi] \colon V \to E$ for each $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. In particular, if $\mathbb{A}$ is elliptic, then $\mathbb{A}^*[\xi] \circ \mathbb{A}[\xi]$ (with an obvious definition of the adjoint symbol $\mathbb{A}^*[\xi]$) is an invertible mapping from V to V. In turn, a routine calculation shows that there exists a constant $c_n > 0$ such that for each $u \in \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; V)$ there holds

$$u(x) = c_n \mathscr{F}^{-1}_{\xi \mapsto x}((\mathbb{A}^*[\xi] \circ \mathbb{A}[\xi])^{-1} \mathbb{A}^*[\xi] \widehat{\mathbb{A}[D]u}) =: \Phi(\mathbb{A}[D]u)(x) \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{2.6}$$

In consequence, since $(\mathbb{A}^*[\xi] \circ \mathbb{A}[\xi])^{-1} \mathbb{A}^*[\xi]$ is homogeneous of degree -1 in ξ, the operator Φ is a fractional integration operator of order $(n-1)$.

Remark 2.1. Differentiating (2.6) with respect to x and keeping in mind the fact that Φ is a fractional integration operator of order $(n-1)$, it is straightforward to deduce that the mapping $\Psi \colon \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; V) \to \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; V \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ given by $\Psi \colon \mathbb{A}[D](u) \mapsto \mathrm{D}u$ is given by a singular integral operator of convolution type (see [30], chapter I) that arises as the Cauchy principal value integral of $\mathbb{A}[D]u$ with a kernel that grows like $|x|^{-n}$. In conclusion, the standard properties of such operators imply that Ψ continuously extends to a mapping $\mathrm{L}^p \to \mathrm{L}^p$ if and only if $1 < p < \infty$.

In the case of the elliptic symmetric gradient operator $\mathbb{A} = \varepsilon$, carrying out the Fourier inversion given in (2.6) can be shown to precisely yield the coefficients given by the Smith representation formula (2.4).

Proposition 2.2 ($\mathrm{BD} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{s,1}$). *Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and K a relatively compact subset of Ω. Then for every $0 < s < 1$ there exists a constant $C = C(K, s) > 0$*

$$\|u\|_{\mathrm{W}^{s,1}(K;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|u\|_{\mathrm{BD}(K)} \tag{2.7}$$

holds for all $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and fix $s < t < 1$. Since Φ given by (2.6) is a Riesz potential operator of order $(n-1)$, we obtain for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \neq y$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| &= |\Phi(\varepsilon(u))(x) - \Phi(\varepsilon(u))(y)| \\ &\leq C \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varepsilon(u)(z) \left(\frac{1}{|z-x|^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{|z-y|^{n-1}} \right) \mathrm{d}z \right| \\ &\leq C|x-y|^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\varepsilon(u)(z)| \left(\frac{1}{|z-x|^{n-1+t}} + \frac{1}{|y-z|^{n-1+t}} \right) \mathrm{d}z, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where we have used the elementary inequality

$$\big| |a-c|^{-(n-1)} - |b-c|^{-(n-1)} \big| \leq C \big(|a-b|^t \big(|a-c|^{-(n-1+t)} + |b-c|^{-(n-1+t)} \big) \big)$$

for all $a,b,c\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ with $a\neq b\neq c$ and a constant $C>0$. Fixing a ball $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{B}(z,r)\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, dividing (2.8) by $|x-y|^{n+s}$ and integrating with respect to $x,y\in\mathrm{B}$ consequently yields

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\mathrm{B}\times\mathrm{B}}\frac{|u(x)-u(y)|}{|x-y|^{n+s}}\,\mathrm{d}(x,y)&\leq C\iint_{\mathrm{B}\times\mathrm{B}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)(z)|}{|z-x|^{n-1+s}}\,\mathrm{d}z\frac{\mathrm{d}(x,y)}{|x-y|^{n+s-t}}\\&\quad+C\iint_{\mathrm{B}\times\mathrm{B}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)(z)|}{|y-z|^{n-1+s}}\,\mathrm{d}z\frac{\mathrm{d}(x,y)}{|x-y|^{n+s-t}},\end{aligned}$$

and due to symmetry reasons it suffices to suitably estimate the first term on the right side. Since u vanishes outside a compact set $K\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, we obtain for some sufficiently large ball $\mathrm{B}'=\mathrm{B}(0,R)$ by Young's convolution inequality (also note $n+s-t<n$)

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\mathrm{B}\times\mathrm{B}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)(z)|}{|z-x|^{n-1+s}}\,\mathrm{d}z\frac{\mathrm{d}(x,y)}{|x-y|^{n+s-t}}&\leq C(s,t)\mathscr{L}^n(\mathrm{B})\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}\int_{\mathrm{B}'}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{|z|^{n-1+s}}\\&\leq C(s,t)\mathscr{L}^n(\mathrm{B})\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}R^{1-s}.\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, for any compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^n$ there exists a constant $C=C(K,s)>0$ such that $[u]_{\mathrm{W}^{s,1}(K;\mathbb{R}^N)}\leq C\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(K;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}$ holds for all $u\in\mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$. To obtain the full statement, let $u\in\mathrm{BD}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $K\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary compact set. Then there exists a sequence $(u_k)\subset\mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$ that strictly converges to u. As a consequence of Fatou's lemma we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}[u]_{\mathrm{W}^{s,1}(K;\mathbb{R}^n)}&\leq\liminf_{k\to\infty}[u_k]_{\mathrm{W}^{s,1}(K;\mathbb{R}^n)}\leq C(K,s)\liminf_{k\to\infty}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}\\&\leq C(K,s)\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the statement we aim for is of local nature, the previous estimate together with a routine localisation argument concludes the proof. □

The preceding result can be even strengthened (see Lemma 3.4), however, we decided to include the proof of the preceding proposition for the sake of the argument. Finally, we recall the space of *rigid deformations*

$$\mathcal{R}(\Omega):=\big\{r\colon\Omega\ni x\mapsto Ax+b\colon\ A\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n},\ A^{\mathsf{T}}=-A,\ b\in\mathbb{R}^n\big\}$$

and the following Poincaré–type inequality for BD–functions:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then there exists a constant $C>0$ which only depends on n such that for all $u\in\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$*

$$\inf_{r\in\mathcal{R}(\Omega)}\int_\Omega|u-r|\,\mathrm{d}x\leq C|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)|(\overline{\Omega}).$$

2.3. **Weights and Weighted Function Spaces.** Let $w\colon\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ be a *weight*, i.e., a non–negative, locally integrable function. We say that w belongs to the *Muckenhoupt class* A_p, $1\leq p<\infty$, provided

$$[w]_{A_p}:=\sup_Q\fint_Q w\,\mathrm{d}y\left(\fint_Q w^{1-p'}\,\mathrm{d}y\right)^{p-1}<\infty,\qquad(1<p<\infty)\tag{2.9}$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes $Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, we say that w belongs to the *Muckenhoupt class* A_1 provided there exists a constant $C>0$ such that $\mathcal{M}w\leq Cw$ $\mathscr{L}^n$–a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^n$; in this case, the infimum of all such $C>0$ is denoted $[w]_{A_1}$. For further reference, let us note that by the very definition of the Muckenhoupt classes we have that

$$1\leq p_1\leq p_2<\infty\Rightarrow A_{p_1}\leq A_{p_2}\quad\text{and}\quad w\in A_p\Leftrightarrow w^{1-p'}\in A_{p'}.\tag{2.10}$$

A deeper result we shall make use of below is the *open ended property* of Muckenhoupt weights. More precisely, see [35], Prop. IX.4.5, if $w\in A_p$ for some $1<p<\infty$, then there exists a constant $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(p)>0$ such that $w\in A_{p-\varepsilon}$ too.

The particular reason for considering these classes of weights is that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator $\mathcal{M}$ has convenient mapping properties as a mapping on the respective weighted Lebesgue spaces

$$\mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n) := \big\{ f\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}\colon \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|^p w \,\mathrm{d}x < \infty \big\}, \qquad 1 < p < \infty.$$

Indeed, we have that $\mathcal{M}$ is a bounded linear operator $\mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n; w) \to \mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n; w)$ for $1 < p < \infty$ if and only if $w \in A_p$. A consequence thereof is that singular integrals of convolution type are bounded as mappings $\mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n; w) \to \mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n; w)$, $1 < p < \infty$, provided $w \in A_p$:

Lemma 2.4. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and let T be a Calderón–Zygmund operator. Then there exists a constant $c = c_T > 0$ such that for any $w \in A_p$,*

$$\|T\|_{\mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n;w)\to\mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n;w)} \le cpp'[w]_{A_p}^{\max\{1,1/(p-1)\}}.$$

The main consequence of this lemma for theme of the present paper is that, because the mapping $T\colon \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ given by $T\colon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) \mapsto \nabla u$ is a singular integral of convolution type, T continuously extends to a bounded linear operator $T\colon \mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n; w) \to \mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n; w)$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and $w \in A_p$. Before passing to the weighted Besov spaces which play an instrumental role in the main part of the paper, we recall Coifman & Rochberg's construction on the building of A_1–weights; see [35], Prop. IX.3.3:

Lemma 2.5 (Coifman–Rochberg Lemma)**.** *Let μ be a non–negative Borel measure so that $\mathcal{M}\mu \not\equiv \infty$. Then for each $0 \le \delta < 1$, $(\mathcal{M}\mu)^\delta \in A_1$ with A_1–constant which depends only on δ.*

We will now introduce and discuss weighted Besov spaces. To this end, we recall the following weighted fractional integration theorem due to Muckenhoupt & Wheeden [25], p. 267; here, for $0 < \alpha < n$,

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \,\mathrm{d}y, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

denotes the α–th fractional integration operator.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $0 < \alpha < n$ and $1 < p < n/\alpha$ and put $1/p^* = 1/p - \alpha/n$. Suppose that $\omega \in A_q$, where $q = p^*/p' + 1$. Then*

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\mathcal{I}_\alpha f|^{p^*} \omega \,\mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \le C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|^p \omega^{\frac{n-\alpha p}{n}} \,\mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for every $f \in \mathrm{L}^p_{\omega_{\alpha,p}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\omega_{\alpha,p} := \omega^{\frac{n-\alpha p}{n}}$.

The previous proposition immediately implies the following

Lemma 2.7. *Let $0 < \sigma < 1$ and $1 \le p < \infty$. Suppose that $\omega \in A_q$, where $q = p^*/p' + 1$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \sigma$ be arbitrary. Then if a measurable function $u\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfies*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{n+(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}} \omega(x) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}y < \infty,$$

then there holds $u \in \mathrm{L}^r_{\omega'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for every $p \le r < \frac{np}{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}$, where $\omega' := \frac{n}{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}$.

From this weighted fractional integration theorem we deduce the following embedding result for weighted Nikolskiĭ spaces; note that if ω is a weight on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we write $\omega := \omega(\cdot, 1)$ with slight abuse of notation for a weight on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $0 < \sigma < 1$ and $1 \le p < \infty$. Suppose that $\omega \in A_q$, where $q = p^*/p' + 1$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \sigma$ be arbitrary. Then there holds*

$$\mathrm{B}^{\sigma,p}_{\infty,\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{L}^r_{\omega'}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{for every } p \le r < \frac{np}{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}, \tag{2.11}$$

where $\omega' := \omega^{\frac{n}{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}}$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.6 it suffices to prove that $\mathrm{B}^{\sigma,p}_{\infty,\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{\sigma-\varepsilon,p}_{\omega'}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N)$ for every $0<\varepsilon<\sigma$. Let $u \in \mathrm{B}^{\sigma,p}_{\infty,\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be arbitrary. Then we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}}\omega(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{|u(x+h)-u(x)|^p}{|h|^{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}}\omega(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}h\\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathrm{B}(0,\varepsilon)}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\mathrm{B}(0,\varepsilon)}\right)\frac{1}{|h|^{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|u(x+h)-u(x)|^p\omega(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}h\\ &\leq \int_{\mathrm{B}(0,\varepsilon)}\frac{1}{|h|^{n-\varepsilon p}}\,\mathrm{d}x\|u\|^p_{\mathrm{B}^{\sigma,p}_{\infty,\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N)}+2\|u\|^p_{\mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C\|u\|^p_{\mathrm{B}^{\sigma,p}_{\infty,\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N)}.\end{aligned}$$

The full statement then follows by a standard interpolation argument. □

As an important consequence, locality of the weighted Besov spaces allows us to deduce

$$\mathrm{B}^{\sigma,p}_{\infty,\omega,\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{L}^r_{\omega',\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{for every } p \leq r < \frac{np}{n-(\sigma-\varepsilon)p} \tag{2.12}$$

with the exponents and weights adjusted due to Lemma 2.8.

2.4. **On the Space $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*$.** In order to work with suitably weak perturbations when applying the Ekeland variational principle, we record some properties of the dual space $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*$ and adapt the results obtained in [7], therein stated for the negative Sobolev space[1] $\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}$ to our setting. To compare with the approach pursued in [7], we recall that

$$\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) := \big\{T \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)\colon\ T = v_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \partial^k v_k \text{ with } v_0,\dots,v_n \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)\big\},$$

and the norm on $\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ is given by

$$\|T\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} := \inf\sum_{k=0}^n \|w_k\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)},$$

the infimum running over all $(w_0,\dots,w_n) \in (\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^{n+1}$ representing T, i.e., $T = w_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \partial^k w_k$. Then $(\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n), \|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)})$ is a Banach space. On the other hand, a distribution $T \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ belongs to $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$ if and only if the norm

$$\|T\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*} := \sup\big\{\langle T,\varphi\rangle\colon\ \varphi \in \mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } \|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1\big\} < \infty, \tag{2.13}$$

whenever this expression makes sense; here, we work with the gradient norm

$$\|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} := \|\nabla\varphi\|_{\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \qquad \text{for } \varphi \in \mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n).$$

As a dual space, $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$ is complete. We finish this section with two elementary lemmas:

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open. Then $\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow (\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$.*

Proof. Let $T \in \mathrm{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ be arbitrary but fixed and write $T = w_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \partial^k w_k$ with $w_0,\dots,w_n \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, for arbitrary $\varphi \in \mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0} \leq 1$, we obtain by the very definition of distributional derivatives and the norm on $\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}$

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle T,\varphi\rangle| &\leq |\langle w_0,\varphi\rangle| + \left|\sum_{k=1}^n \langle \partial^k w_k,\varphi\rangle\right| \leq |\langle w_0,\varphi\rangle| + \left|\sum_{k=1}^n \langle w_k,\partial^k\varphi\rangle\right|\\ &\leq C\|w_0\|_{\mathrm{L}^1}\|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0} + \sum_{k=1}^n \|w_k\|_{\mathrm{L}^1}\|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0} = \left(\sum_{k=0}^n \|w_k\|_{\mathrm{L}^1}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Passing to the infimum over all such representations of T, the previous estimate immediately implies the claim. □

[1] Since $\mathrm{W}^{-1,p} \cong (\mathrm{W}^{1,\frac{p}{p-1}}_0)^*$ for $1<p<\infty$, one might expect $\mathrm{W}^{-1,1} \cong (\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*$, however, this is not the case. Therefore we rather define $\mathrm{W}^{-1,1}$ than approaching it through duality arguments.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and $K \subset \Omega$ a relatively compact subset of Ω. Let $v \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then for any $s = 1, ..., n$ and any $0 < |h| < \operatorname{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$ we have*

$$\|\Delta_{s,h} v\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}(K;\mathbb{R}^n))^*} \leq \|v\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(K;\mathbb{R}^n)$ be arbitrary with $\|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(K;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$. Using integration by parts for difference quotients, we estimate

$$|\langle \Delta_{s,h} v, \varphi\rangle| = |\langle v, \Delta^-_{s,h}\varphi\rangle\| \leq \|v\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\Delta_{s,h} v\|_{\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|v\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\nabla v\|_{\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

and hence passing to the supremum over all admissible competitors φ establishes the claim. □

3. An Embedding for BD ∩ BMO

In this section we prove an embedding result for BD ∩ BMO into certain fractional Sobolev spaces which will constitute a substantial part of the proof of the main theorem. The proof combines an argument firstly utilised by Dorronsoro [18] and an embedding result of BD into certain fractional Sobolev spaces. Let us recall that a measurable function $u\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^N$ belongs to $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N)$ if and only if its sharp maximal function given by

$$(\mathcal{M}^\sharp u)(x) := \sup_{Q\,\text{cube}} \fint_Q |u - (u)_Q|\,\mathrm{d}y, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{3.1}$$

belongs to $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The main result of this section is as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$0 < \varepsilon < \min\left\{\frac{(n-1)\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)}{1+pn-p}, \frac{1}{p}\right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Then

$$\mathrm{BD}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \mathrm{W}^{\frac{1}{p}-\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{3.3}$$

Before embarking on the proof of Theorem 3.1, we wish to place some remarks.

Remark 3.2. It is important to note that that the preceding theorem is *false* for $\varepsilon = 0$. Indeed, if it was true in this case, the injections $\mathrm{W}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{BD}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$ would yield $(\mathrm{W}^{1,1} \cap \mathrm{L}^\infty)(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{\frac{1}{p},p}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$. However, as pointed out by Bourgain, Brezis and Mironescu [11], this embedding in general fails: Indeed, a localisation argument would then yield $(\mathrm{W}^{1,1} \cap \mathrm{L}^\infty)((0,1)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{\frac{1}{p},p}((-1,1))$ for any $1 < p < \infty$. Consider the sequence (u_k) given by

$$u_k(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } -1 < x \leq -\frac{1}{2k} \\ 2kx & \text{if } -\frac{1}{2k} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2k} \\ 1 & \text{if } \frac{1}{2k} \leq x < 1. \end{cases}$$

Then (u_k) is uniformly bounded both in $\mathrm{W}^{1,1}((-1,1))$ and $\mathrm{L}^\infty((-1,1))$. Moreover, it converges weakly* in $\mathrm{BV}((-1,1))$ to sgn which, however, does not belong to $\mathrm{W}^{\frac{1}{2},2}((-1,1))$.

To prove the theorem, we first recall a mean value characterisation of fractional Sobolev spaces which can be found in [18].

Lemma 3.3. *Let $0 < s < 1$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$. A function $u \in \mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ belongs to $\mathrm{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if*

$$[u]^*_{s,p} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_0^\infty \fint_{Q(x,t)} \frac{|f - (f)_{Q(x,t)}|^p}{t^{sp}}\,\mathrm{d}\xi \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{t}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, the expression on the left is equivalent to the $\mathrm{W}^{s,p}$–seminorm.

The second ingredient is a embedding result of BD into fractional Sobolev spaces:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $0 < s < 1$. Then $\mathrm{BD}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{s,\frac{n}{n-1+s}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. By Van Schaftingen's study [36], Prop. 6.4., the symmetric gradient operators $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is an elliptic and cancelling operator. Thus, by [36], Thm. 8.1., there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|u\|_{\dot{\mathrm{W}}^{s,\frac{n}{n-1+s}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}$, where $\dot{\mathrm{W}}^{s,\frac{n}{n-1+s}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the respective homogeneous fractional Sobolev space. For the general statement, let $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ and choose a sequence $(u_k) \subset \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $u_k \to u$ strictly and pointwisely $\mathscr{L}^n$–a.e. as $k \to \infty$. Then we obtain, using Fatou's lemma,

$$\|u\|_{\dot{\mathrm{W}}^{s,\frac{n}{n-1+s}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{\dot{\mathrm{W}}^{s,\frac{n}{n-1+s}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \liminf_{k\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|(\mathbb{R}^n) = C|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)|(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

The proof is complete. □

We now come to the

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $u \in (\mathrm{BD}\cap\mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a cube $Q(x,t) = x + [-t,t]^n$, we denote $g_{x,t}(\xi) := u(\xi) - (u)_{Q(x,t)}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We remark in advance that, given $1 < q < \infty$,

$$\|u\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_q} := \sup_{Q\,\mathrm{cube}} \left(\fint_Q |u - (u)_Q|^q \,\mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

defines an seminorm on $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$ which is equivalent to that given by (3.1). Also let us recall from [16] that for a locally integrable function $h\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^N$ its *sharp maximal operator of order* $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ is given by

$$h_\alpha^\sharp(x) := (\mathcal{M}_\alpha^\sharp h)(x) := \sup_{Q\,\mathrm{cube}} \frac{1}{\ell(Q)^{n+\alpha}} \int_Q |h - (h)_Q| \,\mathrm{d}y, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\ell(Q)$ is the sidelength of the respective cube Q. For $1 \leq p < \infty$, we define the (inhomogeneous) *Calderón space* $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$\mathcal{C}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ v \in \mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \colon\ \mathcal{M}_\alpha^\sharp v \in \mathrm{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \right\}$$

and equip it with the canonical norm $\|v\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha,p}} := \|v\|_{\mathrm{L}^p} + \|v_\alpha^\sharp\|_{\mathrm{L}^p}$. Then, by Theorem 5.8, there holds $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the corresponding Besov–Nikolskiĭ–spaces $\mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ whose definition is deferred to the appendix. By standard embeddings of these spaces, we obtain for each $0 < \theta < \alpha$

$$\mathrm{W}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \simeq \mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_p(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}^{\alpha-\theta,p}_1(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}^{\alpha-\theta,p}_p(\mathbb{R}^n) \simeq \mathrm{W}^{\alpha-\theta,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \tag{3.6}$$

with the fractional Sobolev spaces $\mathrm{W}^{s,p} \simeq \mathrm{B}^{s,p}_p$. Our aim is to show

$$\mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{p}-\varepsilon,\frac{n}{n-1+\frac{1}{p}-\varepsilon}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{\frac{1}{p}-\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \tag{3.7}$$

where p and ε are as in the theorem. Since

$$(\mathrm{BD}\cap\mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n) \overset{\text{Lemma } 3.4}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathrm{W}^{s,\frac{n}{n-1+s}} \cap \mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n) \overset{(5.6)}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{C}^{s,\frac{n}{n-1+s}} \cap \mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{3.8}$$

this will imply the claim.

Proof of (3.7). Our argument is centered around the Dorronsoro–type characterisation of the Sobolev spaces $\mathrm{W}^{s,p}$, Lemma 3.3. For $\mathscr{L}^n$–a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\delta(x) > 0$ be arbitrary. We split the left term of (3.4) as

$$[u]^*_{s,p} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^{\delta(x)} (\cdots) \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{t} \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\delta(x)}^\infty (\cdots) \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{t} \,\mathrm{d}x =: \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbf{I}_\delta(x) + \mathbf{II}_\delta(x) \,\mathrm{d}x$$

with an obvious definition for $\mathbf{I}_\delta(x)$ and $\mathbf{II}_\delta(x)$. Firstly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_\delta(x) &= \int_0^{\delta(x)} \frac{1}{t^{(s+\varepsilon)p}} \fint_{\mathrm{B}(x,t)} |g_{x,t}(\xi)|^p \,\mathrm{d}\xi \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{t^{1-\varepsilon p}} \le C \int_0^{\delta(x)} (u^\sharp_{s+\varepsilon}(x))^p \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{t^{1-\varepsilon p}} \\ &\le \frac{C}{\varepsilon p} \delta(x)^{\varepsilon p} (u^\sharp_{s+\varepsilon}(x))^p.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\mathbf{II}_\delta(x) = \int_{\delta(x)}^\infty \fint_{\mathrm{B}(x,t)} |g_{x,t}(\xi)|^p \,\mathrm{d}\xi \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{t^{1+sp}} \le C \int_{\delta(x)}^\infty (u^\sharp(x))^p \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{t^{1+sp}} \le \frac{C}{sp} \delta(x)^{-sp} (u^\sharp(x))^p.$$

We note that in the preceding two estimations the constant $C > 0$ stems from the equivalence of the Calderón seminorms, similarly to the equivalence of the BMO– and BMO_q–seminorms mentioned before. Collecting estimates, we find

$$[u]^*_{s,p} \le C(s,p,\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta(x)^{\varepsilon p} (u^\sharp_{s+\varepsilon}(x))^p + \delta(x)^{-sp} (u^\sharp(x))^p \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.9}$$

We choose for $\mathscr{L}^n$–a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\delta(x) := \left(\frac{u^\sharp(x)}{u^\sharp_{s+\varepsilon}(x)} \right)^{\frac{1}{s+\varepsilon}}$$

and note that we may assume without loss of generality that $u^\sharp_{s+\varepsilon}(x) > 0$ since u is constant otherwise and thus the claim is trivial. Inserting this choice of δ into (3.9), we obtain

$$[u]^*_{s,p} \le C(s,p,\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u^\sharp(x))^{\frac{\varepsilon p}{s+\varepsilon}} (u^\sharp_{s+\varepsilon}(x))^{p-\frac{\varepsilon p}{s+\varepsilon}} \,\mathrm{d}x \le \|u^\sharp\|^{\frac{\varepsilon p}{s+\varepsilon}}_{\mathrm{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u^\sharp_{s+\varepsilon})^{\frac{ps}{s+\varepsilon}} \,\mathrm{d}x = (**).$$

Now note that by Lemma 3.6 below, the fractional maximal functions are log–convex in their smoothness indices. As a consequence, we obtain for $0 < t < s$ and $1 < q < \infty$

$$(\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{s,q} \cap \mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \dot{\mathcal{C}}^{t,\frac{sq}{t}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \qquad \text{for all } 0 < t < s. \tag{3.10}$$

Indeed, write $t = \lambda \cdot 0 + (1-\lambda)s$ with $0 < \lambda < 1$ to deduce for $1 < q < \infty$ and any $v \in (\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{s,q} \cap \mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n)$ that

$$(v^\sharp_t(x))^r \le (v^\sharp_0(x))^{\lambda r} (v^\sharp_s(x))^{(1-\lambda)r}$$

and hence (3.10) follows since $(1-\lambda)s = t$ implies $r = sq/t$.

We return to the estimation of $(**)$. Because $0 < \varepsilon p < 1$, we have $0 < 1 - \varepsilon p < 1$. By assumption, we have $s + \varepsilon = 1/p \in (0,1)$ and $ps/(s+\varepsilon) = p(1-\varepsilon p)$. Define $\Phi(\theta) := \theta n/(n-1+\theta)$, $\theta \in (0,1)$. Since $n \ge 2$, there holds $|\Phi| < 1$ and we have both $\lim_{\theta \searrow 0} \Phi(\theta) = 0$ and $\lim_{\theta \nearrow 1} \Phi(\theta) = 1$. Thus, $\Phi\colon (0,1) \to (0,1)$ is bijective and, choosing $\widetilde{\theta} := (1-\varepsilon p)(n-1)/(n-1+\varepsilon p)$, we see that $\Phi(\widetilde{\theta}) = 1 - \varepsilon p$. With this choice of $\widetilde{\theta}$, the embedding (3.10) gives

$$(\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{\widetilde{\theta}, n/(n-1+\widetilde{\theta})} \cap \mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \dot{\mathcal{C}}^{\frac{1}{p}, p(1-\varepsilon p)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

since $\widetilde{\theta} > \frac{1}{p}$: Indeed, since $0 < \varepsilon p < 1 - \frac{1}{p}$ by assumption, we deduce $p(1-\varepsilon p) - 1 > 0$, and therefore with $\gamma = \varepsilon p$

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\theta} = \frac{(1-\gamma)(n-1)}{n-1+\gamma} > \frac{1}{p} &\Leftrightarrow (p-\gamma p)(n-1) > n-1+\gamma \Leftrightarrow pn - \gamma pn - p + \gamma p > n - 1 + \gamma \\ &\Leftrightarrow pn - p - n + 1 > \gamma + \gamma pn - \gamma p = \gamma(1 + pn - p) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{pn - p - n + 1}{1 + pn - p} > \gamma = \varepsilon p \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{n - 1 - n/p + 1/p}{1 + pn - p} > \varepsilon\end{aligned}$$

which is true by assumption 3.2. The proof is complete. □

Remark 3.5. The preceding proof, in particular, the choice of x–dependent δ, uses some ideas from [5], especially the proof of Proposition 3.1.2 therein.

In the proof of Theorem 3.1, we used the log–convexity of the fractional maximal operator with respect to its index, a fact whose proof we give now:

Lemma 3.6. *The function $s \mapsto \mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{s}v(x)$ is* log*–convex on $(0,1)$ for any locally integrable function $u\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. That is, for any $s,t \in (0,1)$ and any $\lambda \in (0,1)$ there holds*

$$\mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{\lambda s+(1-\lambda)t}v(x) \leq (\mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{s}v(x))^{\lambda}(\mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{t}v(x))^{1-\lambda}. \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. Let $v \in \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If the right side of (3.11) is infinite, there is nothing to prove, so we may assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{s}v(x), \mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{t}v(x) < \infty$. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a non–degenerate cube. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\ell(Q)^{n+\lambda s+(1-\lambda)s}}\int_Q |v-(v)_Q|\,\mathrm{d}x &= \frac{1}{\ell(Q)^{\lambda(n+s)}}\left(\int_Q |v-(v)_Q|\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\lambda}\\ &\quad\times \frac{1}{\ell(Q)^{(1-\lambda)(n+t)}}\left(\int_Q |v-(v)_Q|\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1-\lambda}\\ &\leq (\mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{s}v(x))^{\lambda}(\mathcal{M}^{\sharp}_{t}v(x))^{1-\lambda}.\end{aligned}$$

We then pass to the supremum over all cubes Q to deduce the claim. □

For the sake of better traceability, we explicitely note the following.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $p\varepsilon < 1$. Then for any $N \geq 1$ we have*

$$(\mathrm{BV}\cap\mathrm{BMO})(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N) \subset \mathrm{W}^{\frac{1}{p}-\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{3.12}$$

The previous corollary follows along the same lines as the proof of Theorem 3.1, now using the standard Sobolev embedding $\mathrm{BV}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{\theta,\frac{n}{n-1+\theta}}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $0<\theta<1$. This improves the embedding $(\mathrm{BV}\cap\mathrm{L}^{\infty})(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}^{1/p,p}_{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $1<p<\infty$ as given in Lemma 38.1 in Tartar's monograph [34].

4. Viscosity Approximations

4.1. **The Ekeland–type Approximation.** To avoid manipulations on measures when working with the Euler–Lagrange equation satisfied by the minimiser $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, we shall consider approximate problems which allow to work with LD–functions first. More precisely, starting from an arbitrary minimising sequence, we shall employ Ekeland's variational principle to construct another minimising sequence which is close to the original sequence, however, features convenient optimality properties. For the reader's convenience, we therefore first recall

Lemma 4.1 (Ekeland Variational Principle)**.** *Let (X,d) be a* complete *metric space and $J\colon X \to \mathbb{R}\cup\{\infty\}$, $J \not\equiv \infty$, a lower semicontinuous functional which is bounded from below. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. If $u \in X$ is such that*

$$J(u) \leq \inf_X J + \varepsilon,$$

then there exists $v \in X$ with the following properties: $J(v) \leq J(u)$, $d(u,v) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and for all $w \neq v$ we have

$$J(v) < J(w) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}d(v,w).$$

Since our strategy to prove uniform higher integrability by means of finite differences relies on suitable Nikolskiĭ–type estimates, we will need to apply Ekeland's variational principle with respect to a metric which is considerably weaker than the symmetric–gradient metric $\mathrm{d}(u,v) := \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(v)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}$ on suitable Dirichlet classes. Here we again follow [7], however, invoke the metric induced by the $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*$–norm as discussed in section 2.4. In a preliminary step, we record the following

Lemma 4.2. *Given $p > 1$, let $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to [0,\infty)$ be a convex function such that $f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq c|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^p$ holds for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ with a constant $c > 0$. Given $u_0 \in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and a lower semicontinuous function $g\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to [0,\infty)$, the functional*

$$\mathfrak{F}[u] := \begin{cases} \int_\Omega f(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u))\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega g(u)\,\mathrm{d}x & \text{if } u \in u_0 + \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n), \\ \infty & \text{if } u \in ((\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^* \setminus (u_0 + \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0))(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

is lower semicontinuous to norm convergence on $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $u, u_1, u_2, \ldots \in u_0 + \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $u_k \to u$ strongly in $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$ as $k \to \infty$. By coercive bound on f, we deduce that $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))$ is bounded in $\mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and so, writing $u_k = u_0 + v_k$ with $v_k \in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we use Poincaré's inequality to obtain

$$\int_\Omega |u_k|^p\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \int_\Omega |u_0|^p + |v_k|^p\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \int_\Omega |u_0|^p\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^p\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C.$$

As $p > 1$, we may use Korn's inequality to deduce that (u_k) has a (not relabelled) subsequence which converges to some $v \in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and by continuity of the trace operator on $\mathrm{W}^{1,p}$ with respect to weak convergence, $v \in u_0 + \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ too. Using the compact embedding $\mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow \mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$, and passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can even assume strong convergence $u_k \to v$ in $\mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $k \to \infty$. Since $\mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow (\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow (\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$ by Lemma 2.9, we conclude that $u = v$ $\mathscr{L}^n$–a.e.. Moreover, passing to another subsequence, we may assume that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u)$ in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ as $k \to \infty$ and hence, applying Reshetnyak's theorem in conjunction with the absolute continuity for $\mathscr{L}^n$ of all measures $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_1), \ldots$ involved, we obtain the claim. □

Now fix $p > n$ and let $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ be a generalised minimiser of $\mathfrak{F}$. We then find a sequence $(w_k) \subset \mathcal{D} := u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)$ such that

$$w_k \to u \text{ in } \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } (\mathscr{L}^n, \mathrm{D}w_k) \to (\mathscr{L}^n, \mathrm{D}u) \text{ strictly} \tag{4.2}$$

as $k \to \infty$. By the Reshetnyak continuity theorem and the fact that $w_k \in \mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we deduce that $\mathfrak{F}[w_k] \to \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}]$ as $k \to \infty$ so that (w_k) indeed is a minimising sequence for $\mathfrak{F}$. Moreover, possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\mathfrak{F}[w_k] \leq \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}] + \frac{1}{8k^2} \qquad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.3}$$

As to the boundary values, we find a sequence $(u_k^{\partial\Omega}) \subset (\mathrm{W}^{1,p} \cap \mathrm{L}^\infty_M)(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\|u_0^{\partial\Omega} - u_0\|_{\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{8Lk^2}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and thus, putting $\mathcal{D}_k := u_0^{\partial\Omega} + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)$, we deduce that there exists a sequence $(v_k) \subset \mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v_k \in \mathcal{D}_k \cap \mathrm{L}^\infty_{3M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\|(v_k - u_k^{\partial\Omega}) - (w_k - u_0)\|_{\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{8Lk^2}$$

and hence

$$\|v_k - w_k\|_{\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{4Lk^2} \qquad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now since f is Lipschitz with constant L, we obtain

$$\inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}] \leq \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}_k] + \frac{1}{8k^2}$$

and hence

$$\mathfrak{F}[v_k] \leq \mathfrak{F}[w_k] + \frac{1}{4k^2} \leq \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}] + \frac{3}{8k^2} \leq \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}_k] + \frac{1}{2k^2}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now put for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$f_k(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + \frac{1}{2k^2 A_k}(1+|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$$
$$A_k := 1 + \int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(v_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x$$

and let $g \in \mathrm{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ satisfy $g'' > 0$ such that $g|_{\overline{\mathrm{B}(0,1)}} = 0$ and

$$\exp(|z|^4) \leq 3 + g(z) \qquad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{4.4}$$

We define

$$\mathfrak{F}_k[w] := \begin{cases} \int_\Omega f_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(w))\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega g\left(\frac{w}{3M}\right)\mathrm{d}x & \text{provided } w \in \mathcal{D}_k \\ +\infty & \text{provided } w \in (\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^* \setminus \mathcal{D}_k \end{cases}$$

so that, due to Lemma 4.2, each $\mathfrak{F}_k$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to norm convergence in $(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$. Now observe that due to our choice of g and thus $g(v_k/3M) = 0$ we have

$$\mathfrak{F}_k[v_k] \leq \mathfrak{F}[v] + \frac{1}{2k^2} \leq \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}_k] + \frac{1}{k^2} \leq \inf \mathfrak{F}_k[(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*] + \frac{1}{k^2}. \tag{4.5}$$

In this situation, we may apply Ekeland's variational principle, Lemma 4.1, to find a sequence $(u_k) \subset (\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u_k - v_k\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*} \leq \frac{1}{k}, \\ &\mathfrak{F}_k[u_k] \leq \mathfrak{F}_k[w] + \frac{1}{k}\|w-u_k\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*} \qquad \text{for all } w \in (\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

From (4.8) and Morrey's embedding $\mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{C}^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$, we then deduce that $(u_k) \subset \mathcal{D}_k \cap \mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Finally, we record the following lemma on the perturbed Euler–Lagrange equations satisfied by the single u_k's.

Lemma 4.3 (Approximate Euler–Lagrange Equation)**.** *Let f_k and u_k be defined as above. Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\left|\int_\Omega \langle f_k'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle \psi'\big(\frac{u_k}{L}\big), \frac{\varphi}{L}\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \frac{1}{k}\|\varphi\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*} \tag{4.7}$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ be arbitrary. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $u_k + \varepsilon\varphi, u_k - \varepsilon\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_k$. Consequently, we obtain by (4.8)

$$\mathfrak{F}_k[u_k] - \mathfrak{F}_k[u_k \pm \varepsilon\varphi] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}\|\varphi\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*}.$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{k}\|\varphi\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*} &\leq \frac{\mathfrak{F}_k[u_k \pm \varepsilon\varphi] - \mathfrak{F}_k[u_k]}{\varepsilon} \\ &\xrightarrow{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \pm\left(\int_\Omega \langle f_k'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle \psi'\big(\frac{u_k}{L}\big), \frac{\varphi}{L}\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\right) \end{aligned}$$

from which (4.7) follows at once. □

To explain the advantages of the technically slightly intricate construction of the particular minimising sequence (u_k), let us first make the following

Remark 4.4 (Euler–Lagrange for Measures)**.** It is posssible to directly work on the Euler–Lagrange equation satisfied by a generalised minimiser $u \in \mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F})$. Indeed, transferring Anzellotti's work [3] to functionals of type (1.1), one is able to show that

$$\int_\Omega \langle f'(\mathrm{E}^a u), \mathrm{E}^a \varphi\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \left\langle (f^\infty)' \left(\frac{\mathrm{dE}^s u}{\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u|} \right), \frac{\mathrm{dE}^s \varphi}{\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s \varphi|} \right\rangle \mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s \varphi| = \int_{\partial\Omega} \left\langle (f^\infty)' \left(\frac{u_0 - u}{|u_0 - u|} \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \right), \varphi \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \right\rangle \mathrm{d}\mathscr{H}^{n-1},$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ with $|\,\mathrm{E}^s \varphi| \ll |\,\mathrm{E}^s u|$ such that $\varphi(x) = 0$ $\mathscr{H}^{n-1}$–a.e. on $\{x \in \partial\Omega \colon u(x) = u_0(x)\}$, where $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$.

To conclude with, note that Lemma 4.3 enables us to work with difference quotients applied to functions and to eventually deduce uniform estimates for the single u_k's. In particular, by arbitariness of the generalised minimiser $u \in \mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F})$ as was assumed in this section, we have constructed a sequence converging to u in a suitable sense, and hence uniform estimates on the u_k's will eventually inherit to u. Note that by starting from an arbitrary $u \in \mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F})$, regularity for all generalised minimisers will be established.

As mentioned in the introduction, this differs from the common vanishing viscosity approach (see [8]). Indeed, adding small quadratic perturbations and thereby reducing to minimising sequences in $\mathrm{W}^{1,2}$, manipulations on difference quotients are well–defined, however, we would merely obtain regularity for *one* generalised minimiser. As an alternative and in order to obtain higher regularity for *all* generalised minimisers, we could directly work with the Euler–Lagrange equation satisfied by any $u \in \mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F})$. Such equations genuinely involve measures and hence need to be interpreted in the sense of Anzellotti, see Remark 4.4. Moreover, in this case an implementation of the difference quotient technique seems to be hard.

4.2. **Preliminary Estimates.** In this section we derive non–uniform estimates on the second derivatives of the single members of the approximating sequence (u_k) constructed in the previous section. Albeit these will not inherit to the minimiser, we shall use them to justify the calculations in the subsequent paragraphs.

Lemma 4.5. *The sequence (u_k) is contained in $\mathrm{W}^{2,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$, $0 < r < R < \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega)$ and pick $\rho \in \mathrm{C}^1_c(\mathrm{B}(x_0,R);[0,1])$ with $\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{B}(x_0,r)} \le \varphi \le \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{B}(x_0,R)}$. For $|h| < \operatorname{dist}(\partial\,\mathrm{B}(x_0,R);\partial\Omega)$ and $s = 1, ..., n$, we choose $\varphi := \Delta^-_{s,h}\big(\rho^2 \Delta^+_{s,h} u_k\big)$ as a test function in (4.7) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{II} &:= \int_\Omega \langle \Delta_{s,h} f'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\rho^2 \Delta_{s,h} u_k)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \rho^2 \langle \Delta_{s,h} \psi'\big(\tfrac{u_k}{L}\big), \frac{\Delta_{h,s} u_k}{L}\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \frac{1}{k} \|\Delta^-_{h,s}(\rho^2 \Delta_{h,s} u_k)\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*} \\ &\le \frac{C}{k} \|2\rho\,\mathrm{D}\rho \otimes \Delta_{h,s} u_k\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} + \frac{C}{K} \|\rho^2 \Delta_{h,s} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Note that the right side of the previous inequality indeed is finite for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By convexity of ψ, it is easily seen that $\mathbf{II} \ge 0$. As to $\mathbf{I}$, we introduce the bilinear forms

$$\mathcal{B}_k(x)(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) := \int_0^1 \langle f_k''\big(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k) + th\Delta_{h,s}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\big)\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t, \qquad \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}.$$

Consequently, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I} &= \int_\Omega \left\langle \int_0^1 \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f_k'\big(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k) + th\Delta_{h,s}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\big)\,\mathrm{d}t, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\rho^2\Delta_{s,h}u_k)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_\Omega \mathcal{B}_k\big(\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), 2\rho\,\mathrm{D}\rho\odot\Delta_{s,h}u_k + \rho^2\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_\Omega \mathcal{B}_k\big(\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), 2\rho\,\mathrm{D}\rho\odot\Delta_{s,h}u_k\big)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \mathcal{B}_k\big(\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \rho^2\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned}$$

and hence, going back to (4.8), we obtain after rearranging terms and applying Young's inequality to the symmetric bilinear forms $\mathcal{B}_k(x)$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \rho^2\mathcal{B}_k\big(\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C\int_\Omega \mathcal{B}_k\big(\rho\,\mathrm{D}\rho\odot\Delta_{s,h}u_k, \rho\,\mathrm{D}\rho\odot\Delta_{s,h}u_k\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ + \frac{C}{k}\|\,\mathrm{D}u_k\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}.\end{aligned}$$

By definition of the bilinear forms $\mathcal{B}_k(x)$ and the positive definiteness of f'', we invoke the estimate

$$\big(1+|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2+|\boldsymbol{\zeta}|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \leq c\int_0^1 \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\xi}+t\boldsymbol{\zeta}|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}t, \qquad \boldsymbol{\xi},\boldsymbol{\zeta}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$$

with constant $c=c(p,n)>0$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \rho^2\big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}|\Delta_{h,s}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C_k\int_\Omega |\rho^2\Delta_{h,s}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|\,\mathrm{d}x + C_k\int_\Omega |\Delta_{h,s}u_k|\,\mathrm{d}x \\ + C_k\int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)(x+he_s)|^2+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}|\Delta_{h,s}u_k|^2\,\mathrm{d}x,\end{aligned}$$

where the C_k's are positive constants depending on k. Applying Young's inequality to the first term on the right side of the previous equation, it can be absorbed by the left side. Hence, $u_k\in\mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ implies that

$$\int_\Omega |\rho\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C\left(\int_\Omega \frac{|\rho\Delta_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2}{c}\right) \leq C_k\left(1+\int_\Omega |\,\mathrm{D}u_k|^2+|\,\mathrm{D}u_k|^p\,\mathrm{d}x\right)$$

uniformly in h and s. Sending $h\searrow 0$ and using the standard difference quotient characterisation of Sobolev spaces, we obtain that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\in\mathrm{W}^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$, and by Korn's inequality in L^2 we deduce that $u_k\in\mathrm{W}^{2,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ as claimed. □

Before we embark on the proof of Sobolev regularity for the dual solution, we introduce the auxiliary function $V_\alpha\colon\mathbb{R}^M\to\mathbb{R}^M$ through

$$V_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := (1+|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}\in\mathbb{R}^M. \tag{4.9}$$

A routine estimation then gives

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$ and define V_α by Eq. (4.9). Then we have for any measurable function $v\colon\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^M$, $h\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{e}_s\in\mathbb{R}^n$ the estimate*

$$\tau_{s,h}V_\alpha(v(x)) \sim \frac{\tau_{s,h}v(x+he_s)}{(1+|v(x+he_s)|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}.$$

4.3. **Convex Duality.** To exploit the convexity of the variational integrals studied in this paper, we shall now record some facts about the dual problem which will turn out useful for the study of the differentiability properties of minima for the primal problem. Given a real Banach space X and a function $g\colon X\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we recall its *polar function* $g^*\colon X^*\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ given by

$$g^*(x^*) := \sup_{x\in X}\langle x^*,x\rangle_{X^*\times X} - g(x), \qquad x^*\in X^*$$

and its *bipolar function* $g^{**}\colon X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ given by

$$g^{**}(x) := \sup_{x^* \in X^*} \langle x^*, x\rangle_{X^*\times X} - g^*(x^*), \qquad x \in X.$$

Note that if g is lower semicontinuous and convex, then $g = g^{**}$. In view of the convex minimisation problem (1.4), we note that since $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \to \mathbb{R}$ is lower semicontinuous and convex, $\partial f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ implies the duality relation

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \partial f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \Leftrightarrow f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + f^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle.$$

Since f is assumed to be of class C^2, the preceeding relation implies

$$f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + f^*(f'(\boldsymbol{\xi})) = \langle f'(\boldsymbol{\xi}), \boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}. \tag{4.10}$$

Let us recall that the *Lagrangian* ℓ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(w,\chi) = \ell(u_0+\varphi,\chi) &:= \int_\Omega \langle \chi, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(w)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega f^*(\chi)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \ell(u_0,\chi) + \int_\Omega \langle \chi, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where $(w,\chi) = (u_0+\varphi,\chi) \in (u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)) \times \mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$. Consequently, the *dual functional* $\mathcal{R}\colon \mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{R}[\chi] := \inf\big\{\ell(w,\chi)\colon\ w \in u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)\big\}, \qquad \chi \in \mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}), \tag{4.12}$$

and the *dual problem* consists in maximising $\mathcal{R}$ over $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$. Note that if $\chi \in \mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ is not solenoidal in the sense of distributions, that is, χ does not verify

$$\int_\Omega \langle \chi, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathrm{C}^1_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.13}$$

then choosing any $\varphi \in \mathrm{C}^1_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ for which $\int_\Omega \langle \chi, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x > 0$ and considering the sequence $(\varphi_k) \subset \mathrm{C}^1_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\varphi_k := -k\varphi$ yields

$$\ell(w_k,\chi) := \ell(u_0+\varphi_k,\chi) = \ell(u_0,\chi) - k\int_\Omega \langle \chi, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x \to -\infty, \qquad k \to \infty.$$

Hence we obtain the dichotomic statement that

$$\mathcal{R}[\chi] = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } \operatorname{div}(\chi) \neq 0 \text{ in the sense of distributions,} \\ \ell(u_0,\chi) & \text{if } \operatorname{div}(\chi) = 0 \text{ in the sense of distributions.} \end{cases} \tag{4.14}$$

As a consequence, when maximising the dual functional we can safely stick to distributionally solenoidal competitors. In the sequel we shall give a precise description of the relation between the primal and the dual problem. For the time being, it suffices to focus on the following

Lemma 4.7. *There holds*

$$\inf_{u_0+\mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)} \mathfrak{F}[w] \geq \sup_{\chi\in \mathrm{L}^\infty_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \mathcal{R}[\chi], \tag{4.15}$$

where $\mathrm{L}^\infty_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ *denotes the linear space of all* $v \in \mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ *which are solenoidal in the sense of distributions.*

Proof. We have for all $w = u_0 + \varphi \in u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)$

$$\mathfrak{F}[w] = \sup_{\chi\in \mathrm{L}^\infty_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \ell(w,\chi) \geq \sup_{\chi\in \mathrm{L}^\infty_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \inf_{u_0+\mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)} \ell(v,\chi) = \sup_{\chi\in \mathrm{L}^\infty_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \mathcal{R}[\chi].$$

Passing to the infimum over all such w yields (4.15). □

Recall that

$$\mathfrak{F}_k[w] := \int_\Omega f_k(\varepsilon(w))\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \psi\left(\frac{w}{L}\right)\mathrm{d}x, \qquad w \in \mathcal{D}_k := u_k^{\partial\Omega} + \mathrm{W}_0^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.16}$$

where the $u_k^{\partial\Omega}$'s are defined in the previous section. We put

$$\sigma_k := f_k'(\varepsilon(u_k)), \quad \tau_k := f'(\varepsilon(u_k)), \quad \upsilon_k := \frac{1}{2V_k k^2}\big(1+|\varepsilon(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\varepsilon(u_k),$$

so that in particular $\sigma_k = \tau_k + \upsilon_k$. Since $f \in \mathrm{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ and is of linear growth, we deduce that $|f'|$ is bounded and so (τ_k) is uniformly bounded in $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$. Consequently, by Banach–Alaoglu we find $\tau \in \mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ such that $\tau_k \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \tau$ as $k\to\infty$. Inserting $w = \upsilon_k$ into (4.8), we further deduce

$$\mathfrak{F}_k[u_k] \leq \mathfrak{F}_k[\upsilon_k] + \frac{1}{k^2} \leq \mathfrak{F}[\upsilon_k] + \frac{3}{2k^2} \leq \inf\mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{D}_k] + \frac{2}{k^2} \leq \inf\mathfrak{F}.$$

As a consequence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\upsilon_k\|^{\frac{p}{p-1}}_{\mathrm{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} &\leq \frac{1}{\big(2V_k k^2\big)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}\int_\Omega (1+|\varepsilon(u_k)|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\leq \frac{1}{\big(2V_k k^2\big)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}\left(\mathfrak{F}_k[\upsilon_k] + \frac{1}{k^2}\right) \to 0, \qquad k\to\infty,\end{aligned}$$

and hence there exists $\sigma \in \mathrm{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ such that $\sigma_k \rightharpoonup \sigma$ as $k\to\infty$ (in $\mathrm{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$). Consequently, because (υ_k) converges strongly to 0 in $\mathrm{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$, we deduce that

$$\sigma_k \rightharpoonup \sigma = \tau, \qquad k\to\infty, \tag{4.17}$$

where weak convergence is understood in $\mathrm{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let σ be given by (4.17). Then the following holds:*

(a) *σ is solenoidal in the sense of distributions.*
(b) *σ is a solution to the dual problem.*

Proof. Ad (a). Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{C}_c^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ be arbitrary. Then we have

$$\left|\int_\Omega \langle \sigma, \varepsilon(\varphi)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \lim_{k\to\infty}\left|\int_\Omega \langle \sigma_k, \varepsilon(\varphi)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{k}\|\varphi\|_{(\mathrm{W}_0^{1,\infty})^*} = 0$$

and hence σ is solenoidal in the sense of distributions. Ad (b). We may assume without loss of generality that

$$\inf_{w\in u_0+\mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)}\mathfrak{F}[w] \leq \mathfrak{F}_k[u_k] + \frac{1}{k^2}. \tag{4.18}$$

We combine (4.18) with (4.15) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\chi\in \mathrm{L}^\infty_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \mathcal{R}[\chi] &\overset{(4.15)}{\leq} \mathfrak{F}_k[u_k] + \frac{1}{k^2}\\ &= \int_\Omega f(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2V_k k^2}\int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\overset{(4.10)}{=} \int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\rangle - f^*(\tau_k)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2V_k k^2}\int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\overset{u_k = u_k^{\partial\Omega}+\varphi_k}{=} \int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\rangle - f^*(\tau_k)\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad + \int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi_k)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2V_k k^2}\int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi_k)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad + \int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x = \mathbf{I}+\mathbf{II}+\mathbf{III}.\end{aligned}$$

We write $\mathbf{I}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\rangle - f^*(\tau_k)\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\rangle - f^*(\tau_k)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})-u_0\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &= \mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{II}_k.\end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\tau_k \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \tau$ in $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$, we obtain $\int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x \to \int_\Omega \langle \tau, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x$ as $k\to\infty$. Moreover, since f^* is convex and lower semicontinuous, the variational integral $\mathfrak{G}[v] := -\int_\Omega f^*(v)\,\mathrm{d}x$ is upper semicontinuous with respect to weak*–convergence in $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$. Therefore we obtain

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{I}_k \leq \int_\Omega \langle \tau, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\rangle - f^*(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}x = \ell(u_0,\tau). \tag{4.19}$$

Moreover, since (τ_k) is uniformly bounded in $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ and $u_k^{\partial\Omega}\to u_0$ in $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{II}_k \leq (\sup_j \|\tau_j\|_{\mathrm{L}^\infty})\|u_k^{\partial\Omega}-u_0\|_{\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)} \to 0, \qquad k\to\infty. \tag{4.20}$$

and thus $\limsup_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{I}\leq \ell(u_0,\tau)$. Secondly, since $\varphi_k\in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$, it is admissible in the weak formulation (4.7) and thus we particularly have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Omega \langle \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi_k)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2V_k k^2}\int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varphi_k)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\right| &\leq \frac{1}{k}\|\varphi_k\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*}\\ &\leq \frac{1}{k}\|\varphi_k\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ &\to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $k\to\infty$. Finally, we have

$$\|v_k\|^{\frac{p}{p-1}}_{\mathrm{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \leq \frac{1}{(2V_k k^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}\int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{1}{(2V_k k^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}\left(\mathfrak{F}_k[v_k]+\frac{1}{k^2}\right).$$

and therefore, since we may assume without loss of generality $\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\|_{\mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})} \leq \sqrt{(2V_k k^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}}$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$ (see Remark 4.9 below), Hölder's inequality

gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2V_k k^2}\int_\Omega \big(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x &\leq \left(\frac{1}{(2V_k k^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}\int_\Omega (1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\\ &\quad\times\left(\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})|^p\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{(2V_k k^2)}\int_\Omega (1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\\ &\quad\times \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}\frac{\sqrt{(2V_k k^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}}}{(2V_k k^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}}\\ &\quad\to 0,\qquad k\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, collecting estimates, we have proven that $\tau=\sigma$ is a solution of the dual problem and the proof is complete. □

Remark 4.9 (Approximation of the Boundary Values)**.** In the preceding proof we assumed the bound $\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\|_{\mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}\leq C\sqrt{(2V_k k^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_0)\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$ with a constant $C>0$. This is merely of technical nature, as the $u_k^{\partial\Omega}\in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ are assumed to approximate $u_0\in \mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ in the LD–norm and hence the blow–up of the norms $\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k^{\partial\Omega})\|_{\mathrm{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})}$ is allowed indeed. Moreover, note that we can achieve such a bound easily by passing to a suitable subsequence, however, we omit the technical details for clarity of presentation.

Having proven that σ as defined above is a dual solution, let us now justify that we actually have $\sigma\in \mathrm{W}^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$. Instead of the approximation procedure pursued above, we may simply consider for $\delta>0$ the problems

$$\text{to minimise } \mathfrak{F}_\delta(v):=\mathfrak{F}[v]+\delta\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(v)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \text{ over } u_0+\mathrm{W}^{1,2}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.21}$$

where we temporarily assume that $u_0\in \mathrm{W}^{1,2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. It is then easy to show that for each $\delta>0$, there exists a unique minimiser $u_\delta\in u_0+\mathrm{W}^{1,2}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ of $\mathfrak{F}_\delta$. In this situation, we put

$$f_\delta:=f+\frac{\delta}{2}|\cdot|^2,\quad \tilde{\tau}_k:=f'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_\delta))\ \text{ and }\ \tilde{\sigma}_\delta=f_\delta'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_\delta)).$$

Using Korn's inequality on $\mathrm{W}^{1,2}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$, an almost verbatim repetition of the arguments outlined in [8], chapter 2.1, yields that $\tilde{\sigma}_k\rightharpoonup\tilde{\sigma}$ in $\mathrm{L}^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ for some $\tilde{\sigma}\in\mathrm{L}^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$, which can be equally proven to actually to belong to $\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ and to be a dual solution as well. For the sequence $(\tilde{\sigma}_k)$, we may merge Korn's inequality to repeat the proof of Theorem 2.10 in [8] to deduce that $\tilde{\sigma}\in\mathrm{W}^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$. In a similar vein, the results of [8], section 2.2, equally apply to our problem and thus we deduce that the dual solution is in fact unique. Therefore $\sigma\equiv\tilde{\sigma}$ and we conclude the following

Corollary 4.10. *For the dual solution σ given by (4.17) there holds $\sigma\in\mathrm{W}^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$.*

4.4. **Higher Integrability of Minima.** In this section we provide the estimates that are required for the proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof itself will be a direct consequence of the following

Theorem 4.11. *Let $f\in\mathrm{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ be a μ–elliptic integrand with $1<\mu<2$. Then there exits a number $q>1$ such that for each relatively compact $K\subset\Omega$ there exists a constant $C=C(K,q)>0$ with*

$$\|u_k\|_{\mathrm{W}^{1,q}(K;\mathbb{R}^n)}\leq C\qquad \textit{uniformly in } k\in\mathbb{N}, \tag{4.22}$$

where (u_k) is the sequence constructed in section 4.1.

Proof. In what follows, let $z \in \Omega$ and $0 < r < R < \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$ be arbitrary but fixed. We choose a smooth cut–off function $\rho \in \mathrm{C}^1_c(\mathrm{B}(z,R);[0,1])$ with $\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{B}(z,r)} \leq \rho \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{B}(z,R)}$ and define, for $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|h| < \operatorname{dist}(\mathrm{B}(z,R), \partial\Omega)$,

$$\varphi_k := \tau^-_{s,h}(\rho^2 \tau^+_{s,h} u_k). \tag{4.23}$$

We fix such h for the time being. Each φ_k is admissible in the sense that $\varphi \in \mathrm{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and thus may be inserted into the approximate Euler–Lagrange equation (4.7). Expanding terms, we first obtain (with $\mathrm{B} := \mathrm{B}(z,R)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \int_\Omega \langle f_k'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)), \tau^-_{s,h}\big(\rho^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\tau^+_{s,h}u_k) + 2\rho\nabla\rho \odot \tau^+_{s,h}u_k\big)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle \psi'\left(\frac{u_k}{L}\right), \tau^-_{s,h}(\rho^2\tau^+_{s,h}u_k)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x \right| \\ \leq \frac{1}{k}\|\varphi_k\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*}.\end{aligned}$$

In a first step, let us observe that by convexity of ψ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \langle \psi'\left(\frac{u_k}{L}\right), \tau^-_{s,h}(\rho^2\tau^+_{s,h}u_k)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega \langle \rho\tau_{s,h}\psi'\left(\frac{u_k}{L}\right), \rho\tau^+_{s,h}u_k\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_\Omega \int_0^1 \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\psi'\left(\frac{u_k}{L} + t\frac{\tau_{s,h}u_k}{L}\right), \rho^2\tau^+_{s,h}u_k \right\rangle \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_\Omega \int_0^1 \left\langle \rho\psi''\left(\frac{u_k}{L} + t\frac{\tau_{s,h}u_k}{L}\right)\tau^+_{s,h}u_k, \rho\tau^+_{s,h}u_k \right\rangle \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

and so we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_1 := \int_\mathrm{B} \langle \tau^+_{s,h} f_k'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)), \rho^2\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\tau^+_{s,h}u_k)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x &\leq 2\int_\mathrm{B} \langle \tau^+_{s,h} f_k'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)), \rho\nabla\rho \odot \tau^+_{s,h}u_k\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{k}\|\varphi_k\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0)^*(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} =: \mathbf{I}_2 + \mathbf{I}_3.\end{aligned}$$

We shall now give estimates on $\mathbf{I}_1$–$\mathbf{I}_3$. Arguing similarly as in the proof of Lemma 4.5, but now using strict convexity of the g_k's and μ–ellipticity of f, we may bound $\mathbf{I}_1$ below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_1 &= \int_\Omega \rho^2 \int_0^1 \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f_k'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k) + t\tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)), \tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_\Omega \rho^2 \int_0^1 \left\langle f_k''(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k) + t\tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))\tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\overset{g_k \text{ convex}}{\geq} \int_\Omega \rho^2 \int_0^1 \left\langle f''(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k) + t\tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))\tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq \int_\Omega \rho^2 \int_0^1 \left\langle f''(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k) + t\tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))\tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k), \tau^+_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\overset{\text{Lemma 4.6}}{\geq} c\int_\Omega \frac{|\rho\tau^+_{s,h}V_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))|^2}{\big(1+|\tau_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\big)^{\frac{\mu-2\alpha}{2}}}\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

As to term $\mathbf{I}_2$, let $h > 0$ be arbitrary. We recall that by Theorem 3.1 there holds $\mathrm{BD}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) \cap \mathrm{BMO}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{s-\varepsilon,\frac{1}{s}}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $0 < s < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{s}$. Hence, we obtain for $s = \frac{1}{2}$ and every $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ through use of Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_2 &\leq ch^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}\|\nabla\rho\|_{\mathrm{L}^\infty}\left(\int_\mathrm{B}\rho\left|\frac{\tau_{s,h}f_k'(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))}{h}\right|^2\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int_\mathrm{B}\rho\left|\frac{\tau_{s,h}u_k}{h^{\frac12-\varepsilon}}\right|^2\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac12} \\ &\leq ch^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}\left(\int_\mathrm{B}\rho|\Delta_{s,h}\sigma_k|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int_\mathrm{B}\rho\left|\frac{\tau_{s,h}u_k}{h^{\frac12-\varepsilon}}\right|^2\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac12} =: ch^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}a_kb_k.\end{aligned}$$

By the results of section 4.3, the sequence (a_k) is bounded, and by the aforementioned embedding we see that the b_k's can be uniformly bounded in terms of the BD– and BMO–norms of the u_k's. Since these norms are uniformly bounded by that of u, we conclude that there exists a constant $C = C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $a_k b_k \leq C$ and hence there holds

$$\mathbf{I}_2 \leq Ch^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}} \tag{4.24}$$

uniformly in k. In view of term $\mathbf{I}_3$, we recall Lemma 2.10 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_3 = \frac{1}{k}\|\tau_{s,h}^-(\rho^2\tau_{s,h}^+u_k)\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*} &= \frac{1}{k}h^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}\left\|\Delta_{h,s}^-\left(\rho^2\frac{\tau_{s,h}^+}{h^{\frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2}}}u_k\right)\right\|_{(\mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n))^*}\\ &\overset{\text{Lemma }2.10}{\leq} \frac{1}{k}h^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}\left\|\rho^2\frac{\tau_{s,h}^+}{h^{\frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2}}}u_k\right\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ &\overset{\text{Proposition }2.2}{\leq} \frac{1}{k}h^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}\|u_k\|_{\mathrm{W}^{\frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2},1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ &\leq \frac{C}{k}h^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}\|u_k\|_{\mathrm{BD}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} \overset{k\geq 1}{\leq} Ch^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

since, as argued above, (u_k) is uniformly bounded with respect to BD–norm. Combining the estimates for $\mathbf{I}_1$–$\mathbf{I}_3$ just obtained and dividing by $h^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{2}}$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ to be specified below, we find

$$\int_\Omega \rho^2\left|\frac{\tau_{s,h}^+V_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))}{h^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{4}}}\right|^2\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\left(1+|\tau_{s,h}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\right)^{\frac{\mu-2\alpha}{2}}}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C. \tag{4.25}$$

Now define $\mathbb{W}_k\colon \mathrm{B}\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbb{W}_k := \max_{s\in\{1,\dots,n\}}\sup_{0<|h|<\mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{B};\partial\Omega)}\left(1+|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)|^2\right)^{\frac{\mu-2\alpha}{2}}$$

and, recalling $1<\mu<2$, we find $0<\alpha,\delta<1$ with $0<\mu-2\alpha<\delta<1$. Since $g\leq\mathcal{M}(g)$ holds $\mathscr{L}^n$–a.e. for every $g\in\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we note that

$$\omega_k := \frac{1}{\left(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{W}_k^{\frac{1}{\delta}})\right)^\delta} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{W}_k} \qquad \text{for all } k\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{4.26}$$

We recall that $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$. Thus, noting that $\theta^{-1} := (\mu-2\alpha)/\delta<1$ by our above choices of α and δ, we have $(\mathbb{W}_k)$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathrm{L}^\theta(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$, where $\theta>1$. In turn, by boundedness of the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator on L^p for $p>1$, we conclude that $\mathbb{W}_k^{1/\delta}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathrm{L}^\theta(\mathrm{B})$. In particular, we see that $\mathbb{W}_k^{1/\delta}\not\equiv\infty$ and therefore, by the Coifman–Rochberg Lemma 2.5, we conclude that $\omega_k^{-1} := \left(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{W}_k^{1/\delta})\right)^\delta$ belongs to the Muckenhoupt class A_1 and so, in particular, to A_2. Now by (2.10) we conclude that $\omega_k\in A_2$ with uniformly bounded A_2–constant. Going back to (4.25), we obtain

$$V_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))|_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathrm{B}^{\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{4},2}_{\infty,\omega_k}(\mathrm{B}). \tag{4.27}$$

We invoke the embedding result for weighted Besov spaces, Lemma 2.8, to obtain that for every $\delta>0$ sufficiently small there holds

$$V_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k))|_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathrm{L}^{\beta(\chi)}_{\omega_k^{\beta'(\chi)}} \tag{4.28}$$

for any sufficiently small $\chi>0$ (to be adjusted later), where we have put

$$\beta(\chi) := \frac{2n}{n-2\left(\frac{3-2\varepsilon}{4}-\chi\right)} = \frac{4n}{2n-3+2\varepsilon+4\chi}, \quad \beta'(\chi) := \frac{2n}{2n-3+2\varepsilon+4\chi}.$$

By the definition of V_α, see (4.9), we conclude that

$$|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u_k)| \in \mathrm{L}^{\beta(\chi)(1-\alpha)}_{\omega_k^{\beta'(\chi)}}(\mathrm{B}).$$

Now observe that by Lemma 2.4, we may conclude that

$$|\,\mathrm{D}u_k| \in \mathrm{L}^{\beta(\chi)(1-\alpha)}_{\omega_k^{\beta'(\chi)}}(\mathrm{B})$$

too, provided (a) $\gamma := \beta(\chi)(1-\alpha) > 1$ and (b) $\omega_k^{\beta'(\chi)} \in A_{\beta(\chi)(1-\alpha)}$. Keeping (a) in mind, we again recall the Coifman–Rochberg Lemma 2.5 to conclude that if

$$\delta \cdot \frac{2n}{2n-3+2\varepsilon+4\chi} < 1, \tag{4.29}$$

then $\big(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{W}_k^{1/\delta})\big)^{\beta'(\chi)\delta} \in A_1$ and hence $\omega_k^{\beta'(\chi)} \in A_2$. In turn, again recalling (2.10), we conclude that this suffices to deduce that $\omega_k^{\beta'(\chi)} \in A_\gamma$ if $2 \le \gamma$, that is to say,

$$\alpha \le \frac{3}{2n} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n} - \frac{2\chi}{n}. \tag{4.30}$$

Since we are interested in small $0 < \alpha < 1$, small $\varepsilon, \chi > 0$, condition (a) can be considered satisfied anyway. Because our estimates on the respective Muckenhoupt norms of $\omega_k^{\beta'(\chi)}$ are uniform in k, rewriting terms, we may pass to the limit to obtain

$$\mathbf{I} := \int_{\mathrm{B}} \frac{|\,\mathrm{D}u|^{(1-\alpha)\beta(\chi)}}{(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{W}^{\frac{1}{\delta}}))^{\delta\beta'(\chi)}}\,\mathrm{d}x < \infty.$$

We put $\mathbf{W} := \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{W}^{\frac{1}{\delta}})$ and estimate, using Young's inequality, for arbitrary $\beta > 0$ and $1 < p < \infty$

$$\int_{\mathrm{B}} |\,\mathrm{D}u|^\beta\,\mathrm{d}x \le C\int_{\mathrm{B}} \frac{|\,\mathrm{D}u|^{\beta p}}{\mathbf{W}^p}\,\mathrm{d}x + C\int_{\mathrm{B}} \mathbf{W}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\,\mathrm{d}x = (*). \tag{4.31}$$

We shall now argue that under the given conditions on μ, it is possible to adjust the relevant parameters α, χ and ε in such a way that $\beta \ge 1$ and $(*)$ can be bounded by $\mathbf{I}$.

Let us summarise the conditions which we have to verify and also serve as an implicit definition for p:

$$\gamma = \beta(\chi)(1-\alpha) \ge 2 \tag{4.32}$$

$$\alpha \le \frac{3}{2n} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n} - \frac{2\chi}{n}. \tag{4.33}$$

$$\mu - 2\alpha < \delta < \frac{2n-3+2\varepsilon+4\chi}{2n} \tag{4.34}$$

$$\beta p \overset{!}{=} (1-\alpha)\frac{4n}{2n-3+2\varepsilon+4\chi} = (1-\alpha)\beta(\chi) \overset{(4.32)}{=} \gamma \ge 2 \tag{4.35}$$

$$p = \delta\beta'(\chi), \qquad \frac{p}{p-1} \le \frac{\delta}{\mu-2\alpha}. \tag{4.36}$$

Let us briefly justify why instead of (4.36) we may work with the weaker condition

$$p \ge \delta\beta'(\chi), \qquad \frac{p}{p-1} \le \frac{\delta}{\mu-2\alpha}. \tag{4.37}$$

Indeed, splitting $\mathrm{B} := (\mathrm{B}\cap\{\mathbf{W} \le 1\}) \cup (\mathrm{B}\cap\{\mathbf{W} > 1\}) =: A \cup B$, we can safely confine to the set B when studying regularity as on A the symmetric gradients are of class BMO by the usual mapping properties of singular integrals. The argument itself can be made precise by use of Lipschitz truncations, however, is standard and is left to the interested

reader. For the sake of simplicity, we confine to the case $n = 2$, the general case being a small modification thereof which can be accomplished similarly. The conditions become

$$\alpha \leq \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \chi. \tag{4.38}$$

$$\mu - 2\alpha < \delta < \frac{1+2\varepsilon+4\chi}{4} \tag{4.39}$$

$$\beta p \overset{!}{=} (1-\alpha)\frac{8}{1+2\varepsilon+4\chi} = (1-\alpha)\beta(\chi) = \gamma \geq 2 \tag{4.40}$$

$$p \geq \delta\beta'(\chi), \qquad p \geq \left(\frac{\delta}{\mu-2\alpha}\right)' = \frac{\delta}{\delta-\mu+2\alpha}, \tag{4.41}$$

We rewrite (4.41) as

$$p \geq \max\big\{\delta\beta'(\chi), \frac{\delta}{\delta-\mu+2\alpha}\big\} = \delta\max\big\{\frac{4}{1+2\varepsilon+4\chi}, \frac{1}{\delta-\mu+2\alpha}\big\} \tag{4.42}$$

Put $\beta = 1$; this is the minimal requirement. Then we obtain by (4.40) merged with (4.42)

$$(1-\alpha)\frac{8}{1+2\varepsilon+4\chi} \geq \delta\max\big\{\frac{4}{1+2\varepsilon+4\chi}, \frac{1}{\delta-\mu+2\alpha}\big\} \tag{4.43}$$

Assume further $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\delta = \frac{1}{8}$. Then (4.43) becomes

$$\frac{4}{1+2\varepsilon+4\chi} \geq \delta\max\big\{\frac{4}{1+2\varepsilon+4\chi}, \frac{1}{\delta-\mu+1}\big\} \geq \frac{\delta}{\delta-\mu+1} = \frac{1}{1-8\mu+8}, \tag{4.44}$$

where the second inequality can be assumed without loss of generality as $\delta < 1$. Now, if $\mu > 1$ is sufficiently close to 1, then (4.44) is fulfilled, and so is (4.43) and (4.42) and (4.41), and we moreover note that optimising in β, we can even take $\beta > 1$, and hence the proof is complete. □

4.5. **Uniqueness of Generalised Minimisers.** Building on the results of the previous sections, particularly to the proof of the higher Sobolev regularity of generalised minimisers, we now briefly comment on the uniqueness issues addressed in the introduction. In general, the failure of uniqueness of minima of variational integrals (1.4) is mostly due to two reasons (compare [7]): Going back to the relaxed functional $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ given by (1.7), positive homogeneity of f^∞ implies that f^∞ is not strictly convex even if f is. Thus a possible reason for non–uniqueness is the presence of the singular part of minimisers which genuinely only effects the recession parts of $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$. The second reason for non–uniqueness is a possible non–attainment of the correct boundary values which shall be briefly addressed in the end of this section.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $u, v \in \mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F}) \cap \mathrm{BMO}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ be two generalised minimisers with respect to a prescribed Dirichlet class $\mathscr{D}_{u_0} := u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)$. Since f is μ–elliptic with $\mu \leq \mu(n)$, both u and v belong to $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$ by Theorem 1.2. We will show $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(v)$, and this will imply the claim: Indeed, since $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(w) = 0$ is equivalent to $w \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ provided Ω is connected, we deduce that there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ such that $u = v + R$. To prove the claim, suppose that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(u) \neq \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(v)$ on a measurable set U with $\mathscr{L}^n(U) > 0$. Then we obtain, using that f is strictly convex and both $\mathrm{E}^s u$ and $\mathrm{E}^s v$ vanish identically in Ω,

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}}\left[\tfrac{1}{2}(u+v)\right] < \frac{1}{2}(\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u] + \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[v]) = \min\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)],$$

an obvious contradiction. The proof is complete. □

As this section is the generalisation of section 5.4 of [7] to the symmetric gradient case, we also wish to conclude with the following two observations:

Proposition 4.12. *Let Ω be a convex Lipschitz subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that generalised minima of the variational integral $\mathfrak{F}$ are unique modulo rigid deformations. If one generalised minimiser u attains the correct boundary values in the sense that $\operatorname{Tr}(u-u_0)=0$ $\mathscr{H}^{n-1}$–a.e. on $\partial\Omega$, then $\operatorname{GM}(\mathfrak{F})=\{u\}$.*

Proof. Let $R\in\mathcal{R}(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}$ be an arbitrary non–zero rigid deformation and denote $\overline{R}$ its continuous extension to $\overline{\Omega}$. Then we have

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u+R]=\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u]+\int_{\partial\Omega} f^\infty\left(-\overline{R}\odot\nu_{\partial\Omega}\right)\mathrm{d}\mathscr{H}^{n-1} \tag{4.45}$$

because $\operatorname{Tr}(u-u_0)=0$ $\mathscr{H}^{n-1}$–a.e. on $\partial\Omega$. Since the mapping $T\colon\partial\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ given by $T(x):=-\overline{R}\odot\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ for $x\in\partial\Omega$ is continuous and $f^\infty\colon\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is continuous too, it suffices to show that there exists $z\in\partial\Omega$ such that $|\overline{R}(z)\odot\nu_{\partial\Omega}(z)|>0$. Indeed, in this case we conclude by homogeneity of f^∞ and positivity of f that the boundary integral on the right side of (4.45) is strictly positive so that $u+R$ is not a minimiser of $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ over $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$. The proof is the concluded by Proposition 5.4 which provides the required characterisation of generalised minima in terms of $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$. For simplicity, we shall argue for the unit ball $\Omega=\mathrm{B}$ and only sketch the respective generalisation to arbitrary open Lipschitz domains Ω below. Write $\overline{R}(z)=Az+b$. If $|\overline{R}(z)\odot\nu_{\partial\mathrm{B}}(z)|=0$ for all $z\in\partial\mathrm{B}$, then $Az\odot\nu_{\partial\mathrm{B}}(z)=-b\odot\nu_{\partial\mathrm{B}}(z)$ for all $z\in\partial\mathrm{B}$. Since $\nu_{\partial\mathrm{B}}(z)=z$ for any $z\in\partial\mathrm{B}$, this particularly implies $Ae_k\odot e_k=-b\odot e_k$ for all $k=1,...,n$. These identities imply

$$Ae_k\odot e_k=\begin{pmatrix}0&\dots&a_{1k}&0&\dots\\0&\dots&\vdots&0&\dots\\a_{1k}&\dots&a_{kk}&\dots&a_{nk}\\0&\dots&\vdots&0&\dots\\0&\dots&a_{nk}&0&\dots\end{pmatrix}=-\begin{pmatrix}0&\dots&b_1&0&\dots\\0&\dots&\vdots&0&\dots\\b_1&\dots&b_k&\dots&b_n\\0&\dots&\vdots&0&\dots\\0&\dots&b_n&0&\dots\end{pmatrix}=-b\odot e_k.$$

and hence $a_{jk}=-b_j$ for all $j,k=1,...,n$. In consequence, $a_{jj}=-b_j$ for all $j=1,...,n$, but by scew–symmetry of A, $a_{jj}=0$ and thus $b_j=0$ for all $j=1,...,n$. This further implies $a_{jk}=0$ for all $j,k=1,...,n$ and thus $\overline{R}\equiv 0$. If Ω is not a ball, then one may argue similarly, now using the fact that for any open, bounded and convex Lipschitz subset Ω of $\mathbb{R}^n$ there exist linearly independent $z_1,...,z_n\in\partial\Omega$ such that $\nu_{\partial\Omega}(z_1),...,\nu_{\partial\Omega}(z_n)$ are linearly independent too. The details are left to the interested reader. □

We now turn to the second possible source of non–uniqueness which is in the spirit of Santi's example [31] which has been revisited by Beck & Schmidt ([7], Thm 1.16). Whereas the former deals with scalar problems exclusively, the latter primarily deals with the vectorial case. As a consequence, even in the case where the symmetric gradient operator $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is replaced by the full gradient in (1.1), non–uniqueness of generalised minima implies non–attainment of the correct boundary values within the framework of the variational principle (1.4) with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ replaced by D. The respective generalisation of this result to the symmetric gradient case, however, is slightly more intricate and beyond the scope of this paper but shall be addressed in future work.

4.6. **Remarks on General Differential Operators.** Let us finally mention that the approach described in the preceding sections does not take into account the specific structure of the symmetric gradient operator. Indeed, letting $\mathbb{A}$ be an elliptic differential operator of the form (2.5) and $f\in\mathrm{C}^2(E)$ a μ–elliptic convex integrand with $\mu\leq\mu(n)$ with $\mu(n)$ as in Theorem 1.2, we consider the variational integral

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\mathbb{A}}[v]:=\int_\Omega f(\mathbb{A}v)\,\mathrm{d}x\qquad\text{for } v\in v_0+\mathrm{W}^{\mathbb{A},1}_0(\Omega),$$

where $\mathrm{W}^{\mathbb{A},1}(\Omega)$ is the space of all $v\in\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;V)$ such that $\mathbb{A}v\in\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;E)$. This space is equipped with the canonical norm $\|v\|_{\mathrm{W}^{\mathbb{A},1}}:=\|v\|_{\mathrm{L}^1}+\|\mathbb{A}v\|_{\mathrm{L}^1}$, and thus is a generalisation of the space LD as introduced above. In the same spirit as explained in section 2.2, the

spaces $\mathrm{W}_0^{\mathbb{A},1}(\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{BV}_{\mathbb{A}}(\Omega)$ can be defined canonically, and the notion of generalised minima is generalised in the obvious manner too. We then have as a straightforward generalisation of the above arguments:

Corollary 4.13. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an elliptic and cancelling differential operator. If $f\colon E\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a C^2–integrand which is μ–elliptic for $\mu\leq\mu(n)$ with $\mu(n)$ given by Theorem 1.2, then any generalised minimiser $u\in\mathrm{BV}_{\mathbb{A}}(\Omega)\cap\mathrm{BMO}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;V)$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ belongs to $\mathrm{W}^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;V)$ for some $p\geq 1$.*

Let us remark that an operator $\mathbb{A}$ of the form (2.5) is called *cancelling* provided $\bigcap_{\xi\neq 0}\mathbb{A}[\xi](V)=\{0\}$. This notion has been introduced by Van Schaftingen [36] and enters corollary 4.13 in that it is necessary to establish the results of section 3. Indeed, an argument used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 relies on the Sobolev–type embedding, Proposition 3.4, whose generalisation to the framework of $\mathrm{BV}_{\mathbb{A}}$–spaces is possible if and only if $\mathbb{A}$ is both elliptic and cancelling, see [36]. In particular, in the important case where $\mathbb{A}$ is the gradient D, we wish to stress that the above corollary generalises the results gathered in [8] to generalised minima that are not necessarily locally bounded for the range of μ given by Theorem 1.2; in particular, see Corollary 3.7 for the critical embedding result.

5. Appendix

5.1. **Relaxation.** As mentioned in the introduction, we now give justification for some results used in the main part of the paper. The primary aim of this section is to link the concept of generalised minima to that of BD–minima (to be introduced below). For this reason, we firstly need to revisit the concept of functions of measures for which general references are [17, 3]:

5.1.1. *Convex Functions of Measures.* Given $m\in\mathbb{N}$, let $f\colon\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a convex function of linear growth, i.e., f satisfies (1.2) with the obvious modifications. In this situation, it can be shown that f^∞ defined by (1.6) is well–defined, convex and 1–homogeneous. Let μ be an $\mathbb{R}^m$–valued Radon measure of finite total variation on an open and bounded set $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$. We denote

$$\mu=\mu^a+\mu^s=\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^n}\mathscr{L}^n+\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}|\mu^s|$$

its Radon–Nikodým decomposition into its absolutely continuous and singular parts μ^a,μ^s with respect to Lebesgue measure, where $|\mu^s|$ denotes the total variation measure of μ^s. We then define a new Radon measure $f[\mu]$ by

$$f[\mu](A):=\int_A f\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^n}\right)\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^n+\int_A f^\infty\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|,\qquad A\in\mathscr{B}(\Omega),\tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathscr{B}(\Omega)$ denotes the Borel–σ–algebra on Ω. We note that, by 1–homogeneity of f^∞, this gives rise to a well–defined measure indeed. Moreover, let us stress that this definition is instrumental in the definition of area–strict convergence as explained in section 2.2.

Let us briefly comment on the derivation of the formula (1.7) for the relaxed functional as given for BV–functions in [22]. Given an open and bounded Lipschitz subset Ω of $\mathbb{R}^n$, pick a ball $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{B}(z,R)$ with $\Omega\Subset\mathrm{B}$. Given a boundary datum $u_0\in\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$, we recall by surjectivity of the trace operator $\mathrm{Tr}\colon\mathrm{LD}(U)\to\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathscr{H}^{n-1}}(\partial U;\mathbb{R}^n)$ on bounded Lipschitz subsets U of $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see section 2.2) that there exists $v_0\in\mathrm{LD}(\mathrm{B}\setminus\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(v_0)|_{\partial\,\mathrm{B}}=0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(v_0)|_{\partial\Omega}=\mathrm{Tr}(u_0)|_{\partial\Omega}$ $\mathscr{H}^{n-1}$–a.e. on $\partial\,\mathrm{B}$ or $\partial\Omega$, respectively. Given $u\in\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, we put

$$\widetilde{u}(x):=\begin{cases}u(x) & \text{for } x\in\Omega,\\ u_0(x) & \text{for } x\in\mathrm{B}\setminus\overline{\Omega}.\end{cases}\tag{5.2}$$

Then there holds $\widetilde{u} \in \mathrm{BD}(\mathrm{B})$, and by the interior trace theorem as recalled in section 2.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\widetilde{u} &= \mathrm{E}^a\widetilde{u} + \mathrm{E}^s\widetilde{u} = \mathrm{E}^a u \llcorner \Omega + \mathrm{E}^s u \llcorner \Omega + \mathrm{E}^s \widetilde{u} \llcorner \partial\Omega + \mathrm{E}^a \llcorner (\mathrm{B}\setminus\overline{\Omega}) \\ &= \mathscr{E}u \mathscr{L}^n \llcorner \Omega + \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathrm{E}u}{\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u|}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u| + \mathrm{Tr}(u - v_0) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathscr{H}^{n-1} \llcorner \partial\Omega + \mathscr{E}v_0 \mathscr{L}^n \llcorner (\mathrm{B}\setminus\overline{\Omega}).\end{aligned}$$

We insert this expression for $\mathrm{E}\widetilde{u}$ into (5.1) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f[\mathrm{E}\widetilde{u}](\mathrm{B}) = &\int_\Omega f(\mathscr{E}u)\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^n + \int_\Omega f\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathrm{E}u}{\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\,\mathrm{E}^s u| \\ &+ \int_{\partial\Omega} f^\infty\left(\mathrm{Tr}(u - v_0) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega}\right)\mathrm{d}\mathscr{H}^{n-1} \\ &+ \int_{\mathrm{B}\setminus\overline{\Omega}} f(\mathscr{E}v_0)\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

If we then aim for minimising $f[\mathrm{E}\widetilde{u}](\mathrm{B})$ over all $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, we see by constancy of the very last term of the preceding expression that it does not affect the minimiser $v \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, and thus a function $v \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ minimises $f[\mathrm{E}\widetilde{u}](\mathrm{B})$ if and only if it minimises the relaxed functional given by (1.7). It thus makes sense to make the following

Definition 5.1 (BD–minimisers)**.** *For a given convex function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of linear growth, an open, bounded Lipschitz subset Ω of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and a boundary datum $u_0 \in \mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$, define the relaxed functional $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ by (1.7). We say a that function $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ is a* BD–minimiser *of $\mathfrak{F}$ if and only if*

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u] \leq \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[v] \qquad \text{for all } v \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega). \tag{5.4}$$

Remark 5.2. When minimising $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ over $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, the boundary integral takes the rôle of a penalisation term which forces the minimiser to attain the correct boundary values. Although minima do not attain the correct boundary values in general, deviations from the correct boundary values are prenalised through enlarging the value of the functional.

We conclude this section by recalling two results due to Reshetnyak concerning the (lower semi–)continuity of convex functions of measures in the version as given by Beck & Schmidt in [7], also see the recent work of Spector [29].

Proposition 5.3 (Reshetnyak, [27])**.** *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ open and let (μ_k) be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^m$–valued Radon measures of finite total variation which converges to a $\mathbb{R}^m$–valued Radon measure of finite total variation μ on Ω in the weak*–sense. Moreover, assume that all measures μ_k and μ take values in some closed convex cone $K \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Then the following holds:*

(a) Lower Semicontinuity. *If $\widetilde{f}\colon K \to [0,\infty]$ is a lower semicontinuous function, then there holds*

$$\int_\Omega \widetilde{f}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu| \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \widetilde{f}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_k}{\mathrm{d}|\mu_k|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu_k|.$$

(b) *If $\mu_k \to \mu$ strictly[2] as $k \to \infty$ and $\widetilde{f}\colon K \to [0,\infty)$ is a continuous and 1–homogeneous function, then there holds*

$$\int_\Omega \widetilde{f}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu| = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \widetilde{f}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_k}{\mathrm{d}|\mu_k|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu_k|.$$

[2]In the sense that $\mu_k \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu$ and $|\mu_k|(\Omega) \to |\mu|(\Omega)$ as $k \to \infty$.

5.1.2. *Generalised and* BD*–Minima.* Consider the functional (1.1) on the Dirichlet class $\mathcal{D} := u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)$. Having introduced both the concept of generalised minima in (1.5) and that of the BD–minima in the previous section, we now aim for showing the following result which links the two concepts:

Proposition 5.4. *Let Ω be an open and bounded Lipschitz subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Given a convex and continuous integrand $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to \mathbb{R}$ and a boundary datum $u_0 \in \mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$, define $\mathfrak{F}$ by (1.7). Then the following are equivalent for $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$:*

(a) *u is a generalised minimiser in the sense of (1.5).*
(b) *u is a* BD*–minimiser in the sense of (5.4).*

The proof requires some technical preparations which we supply now. For this, let Ω be a given open and bounded Lipschitz subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and choose an open and bounded Lipschitz subset $\widetilde{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\Omega \Subset \widetilde{\Omega}$. Given $u_0 \in \mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$, by surjectivity of the trace operator on BD (compare section 2.2), we may extend u_0 to a function $\widetilde{u_0} \in \mathrm{LD}_0(\widetilde{\Omega})$. The following two lemmas are straightforward generalisations of the results gathered in [8], chapter 2.3.1, whose proofs we leave to the reader:

Lemma 5.5 (Area–Strict Approximation)**.** *Given $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and u_0 as above, let $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ and denote its extension to $\widetilde{\Omega}$ via $\widetilde{u_0}$ by $\widetilde{u}$. Then there exists $(u_k) \subset u_0 + \mathrm{C}^\infty_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\widetilde{u_k} \to \widetilde{u}$ area–strictly in $\widetilde{\Omega}$ as $k\to\infty$, where $\widetilde{u_k}, \widetilde{u}$ denote the extensions of u_k, u to $\widetilde{\Omega}$ by $\widetilde{u}$, respectively.*

Lemma 5.6. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, bounded and Lipschitz. If $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to \mathbb{R}^+_0$ is convex and of linear growth, then the functional*

$$\mathfrak{G}[u] := \int_U f(\mathscr{E}u)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_U f^\infty\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathrm{E}u}{\mathrm{d}|\mathrm{E}^s u|}\right)\mathrm{d}|\mathrm{E}^s u|, \qquad u \in \mathrm{BD}(U)$$

is continuous with respect to area–strict convergence.

Proof of Proposition 5.4. The proof is adapted from [8] to the symmetric gradient–setting. To prove the implication (a)⇒(b), let $u \in \mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F})$ and pick by definition of $\mathrm{GM}(\mathfrak{F})$ a sequence $(v_k) \subset \mathscr{D}_{u_0} := u_0 + \mathrm{LD}_0(\Omega)$ such that $u_k \to u$ strongly in $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $k\to\infty$. By Lemma 5.6, $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to L^1–convergence, and thus

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u] \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u_k] \overset{(*)}{=} \liminf_{k\to\infty} \mathfrak{F}[u_k] = \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathscr{D}_{u_0}],$$

where $(*)$ holds as $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ coincide on any subset of $\mathrm{LD}(\Omega)$, whereas the last equality holds since (u_k) is $\mathfrak{F}$–minimising. Hence (b) follows. To prove the remaining implication, let $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ be a BD–minimiser of $\mathfrak{F}$. By Lemma 5.5, we find $(u_k) \subset u_0 + \mathrm{C}^\infty_c(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\widetilde{u_k} \to \widetilde{u}$ in the area–strict sense on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ as $k\to\infty$. Now, since f is convex, an easy adaption of the results of Goffmann & Serrin [23] yields that the L^1–Lebesgue–Serrin extension of $\mathfrak{F}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{F}^*[v] := \inf\left\{\liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathfrak{F}[v_j]\colon\ (v_j) \subset \mathrm{C}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n),\ v_k \to v \text{ in } \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)\right\}, \qquad v \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega),$$

coincides with $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$. Since $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ is continuous with respect to area–strict convergence by Lemma 5.6, we thus conclude

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u] = \lim_{j\to\infty} \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u_j] = \lim_{j\to\infty} \mathfrak{F}[u_j],$$

and since area–strict convergence particularly implies L^1–convergence of the u_k to u, the claim is complete provided we can show

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u] = \min \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)] = \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathscr{D}_{u_0}]. \tag{5.5}$$

The first equality is trivial. Since $\mathscr{D}_{u_0} \subset \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, we have the inequality $\min \mathfrak{F}[\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)] \leq \inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathscr{D}_{u_0}]$. For the remaining inequality '$\geq$', pick a BD–minimiser $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ and

choose, due to Lemma 5.5, a sequence $(u_k) \subset u_0 + \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \mathscr{D}_{u_0}$ such that $\widetilde{u_k} \to \widetilde{u}$ in the area–strict sense on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ as $k \to \infty$. Then we have by Lemma 5.6

$$\inf \mathfrak{F}[\mathscr{D}_{u_0}] \le \mathfrak{F}[u_k] = \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u_k] \to \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[u] = \min \overline{\mathfrak{F}}[\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)], \qquad k \to \infty.$$

The proof is complete. □

We conclude with the following

Proposition 5.7 (Existence)**.** *In the situation of Definition 5.1, suppose that the variational integrand $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (1.2). Then there exists a* BD*–minimiser u of $\mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. The proof is along the lines of the direct method. We follow the construction following (5.2) and aim for minimising $f[\mathrm{E}\widetilde{u}](\mathrm{B})$ over the class $\mathcal{Q}$ consisting of all $\widetilde{u} \in \mathrm{BD}(\mathrm{B})$ which, in turn, are exclusively defined by $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$. Let $(\widetilde{u_k}) \subset \mathcal{Q}$ be a minimising sequence for $f[\mathrm{E}\cdot](\mathrm{B})$. By (1.2) and Poincaré's Inequality, we deduce that $(\widetilde{u_k})$ is uniformly bounded with respect to the norm in $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$. Hence, by the standard weak*–compactness theorem for BD (see section 2.2) there exists $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ such that $\widetilde{u_k} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u$ as $k \to \infty$ on B. By Reshetnyak's Theorem 5.3, $f[\mathrm{E}u](\mathrm{B}) \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} f[\mathrm{E}\widetilde{u_k}](\mathrm{B})$. Now use (5.3) to conclude the claim. □

5.2. **Besov Spaces.** In this section we briefly revisit Besov spaces and highlight their connection to the Calderón spaces as is needed in the proof of Theorem 3.1; for more background information, the reader is referred to [5], chapter 4. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $\mathrm{spt}(\hat{\varphi}) \subset \mathrm{B}(0,1) =: \mathrm{B}_0$ and $\hat{\varphi}(\xi) = 1$ on $\mathrm{B}(0,\frac{1}{2}) =: \mathrm{B}_1$. We put, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\varphi_k(x) := 2^{kn}\varphi(2^k x)$ and let $\Phi_k(x) := \varphi_k(x) - \varphi_{k-1}(x)$. In consequence, $\mathrm{spt}(\widehat{\Phi_k}) \subset \mathrm{B}(0,2^k) \setminus \mathrm{B}(0,2^{k-2}) =: \mathrm{B}_{-k} \setminus \mathrm{B}_{-k+2}$. Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < p, q \le \infty$, the *Besov spaces* $\mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ then are defined by

$$\mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_q(\mathbb{R}^n) := \big\{u \in \mathscr{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)\colon\ \|\varphi * u\|_{\mathrm{L}^p} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (2^{k\alpha}\|\Phi_k * u\|_{\mathrm{L}^p})^q < \infty\big\}, \qquad 0 < q < \infty,$$

$$\mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) := \big\{u \in \mathscr{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)\colon\ \|\varphi * u\|_{\mathrm{L}^p} < \infty \text{ and } \sup_{k\ge 1} 2^{k\alpha}\|\Phi_k * u\|_{\mathrm{L}^p} < \infty\big\}, \qquad q = \infty.$$

Here, $\mathscr{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are the tempered distributions on $\mathbb{R}^n$. To define the homogeneous variants of these spaces, note that since $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\Phi_k}(\xi) = 1$ for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $\widehat{\Phi_k}(0) = 0$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there holds $\widehat{\Phi_k}\, \mathrm{D}^\beta \delta_0 =$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^n_0$, where δ_0 as usual denotes the Dirac delta distribution centered at zero. Hence, $\Phi_k * \mathcal{P} = 0$ for any polynomial $\mathcal{P}\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the space of $\mathbb{R}$–valued polynomials on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For α, p and q as above, we then define

$$\dot{\mathrm{B}}^{\alpha,p}_q(\mathbb{R}^n) := \big\{u \in (\mathscr{S}'/\mathfrak{P})(\mathbb{R}^n)\colon\ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \big(2^{k\alpha}\|\Phi_k * u\|_{\mathrm{L}^p}\big)^q < \infty\big\}, \qquad 0 < q < \infty,$$

$$\dot{\mathrm{B}}^{\alpha,p}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) := \big\{u \in (\mathscr{S}'/\mathfrak{P})(\mathbb{R}^n)\colon\ \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{k\alpha}\|\Phi_k * u\|_{\mathrm{L}^p} < \infty\big\}, \qquad q = \infty.$$

It is also possible to define Besov spaces on domains, however, this is not needed here. More important, however, are the following results of Littlewood–Paley–type which embed a large variety of well–known function spaces into the framework of the Besov scales $(\mathrm{B}^{p,q}_\alpha)$. Especially, letting $1 \le p < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have

$$\mathrm{W}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \simeq \mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_p(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

We finally link the Besov spaces to the Calderón spaces:

Lemma 5.8 ([16], Theorems 7.1 and 7.5)**.** *Let $\alpha > 0$. Then the following holds:*

(a) *If $1 \le p < \infty$, then*

$$\mathrm{B}^{\alpha,p}_p(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{C}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}^{\alpha,\infty}_p(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

(b) *If* $1 < p < \infty$, *then*

$$\mathcal{L}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{C}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

As an important consequence of the preceding lemma, we record the embeddings

$$\mathrm{W}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}^{\alpha,\infty}_p(\mathbb{R}^n), \qquad 1 < p < \infty,\ \alpha > 0, \tag{5.6}$$

which immediately follows from Lemma 5.8 in conjunction with the characterisation $\mathrm{W}^{\alpha,p} \simeq \mathcal{L}^{\alpha,p}$ of the fractional Sobolev spaces $\mathrm{W}^{\alpha,p}$ and the Bessel potential spaces $\mathcal{L}^{\alpha,p}$.

References

[1] Ambrosio, L.; Coscia, A.; Dal Maso, G.: Fine properties of functions with bounded deformation. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 139 (1997), no. 3, 201-238.

[2] Ambrosio, L.; Fusco, N.; Pallara, D.: Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

[3] Anzellotti, G.: The Euler equation for functionals with linear growth. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 290 (1985), no. 2, 483-501.

[4] Anzellotti, G.; Giaquinta, M.: Existence of the displacement field for an elastoplastic body subject to Hencky's law and von Mises yield condition. Manuscripta Math. 32 (1980), no. 1-2, 101–136.

[5] Adams, D.R.; Hedberg, L.I.: Function Spaces and Potential Theory. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 314, Springer.

[6] Babadjian, J–F.: Traces of functions of bounded deformation. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 64 (2015), no. 4, 1271–1290.

[7] Beck, L.; Schmidt, T.: On the Dirichlet problem for variational integrals in BV. J. Reine Angew. Math. 674 (2013), 113-194.

[8] Bildhauer, M.: Convex variational problems. Linear, nearly linear and anisotropic growth conditions. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1818. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. x+217 pp.

[9] Bildhauer, M.: A priori gradient estimates for bounded generalised solutions of a class of variational problems with linear growth. J. Convex Ana. 9 (2002), 117–137.

[10] Bildhauer, M.; Fuchs, M.: On a class of variational integrals with linear growth satisfying the condition of μ-ellipticity. Rend. Mat. Appl. (7) 22 (2002), 249-274 (2003).

[11] Bourgain, J. ; Brezis, H. ; Mironescu, P.: Limiting embedding theorems for $W^{s,p}$ when $s \uparrow 1$ and applications. Dedicated to the memory of Thomas H. Wolff. J. Anal. Math. 87 (2002), 77–101

[12] Carozza, M.; Kristensen, J.; Passarelli Di Napoli, A.: Higher differentiability of minimizers of convex variational integrals. Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis 28 (3), 395–411

[13] Christiansen, E.; Matthies, H.; Strang, G.: The saddle point of a differential program. Energy methods in finite element analysis, pp. 309-318, Wiley, Chichester, 1979.

[14] S. Conti; D. Faraco; F. Maggi; S. Müller: Rank-one convex functions on 22 symmetric matrices and laminates on rank-three lines. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 24 (2005), no. 4, 479493.

[15] De Philippis, G.; Rindler, F.: On the structure of $\mathscr{A}$–free measures and applications. Preprint. arXiv:1601.06543

[16] R.A. DeVore and R.C. Sharpley, "Maximal Functions Measuring Smoothness", Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc (Num. 293) 47 Providence, 1984, 115 pp.

[17] Demengel, F.; Temam, R. Convex functions of a measure and applications. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 33 (1984), no. 5, 673-709.

[18] Dorronsoro, J.R.: Mean Oscillation and Besov Spaces. Canad. Math. Bull. Vol. 28 (4) 1985, pp. 474–480.

[19] Ekeland, I.; Temam, R.: Convex analysis and variational problems. North–Holland, Amsterdam 1976.

[20] Fonseca, I.; Müller, S.: Relaxation of quasiconvex functionals in $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^p)$ for integrands $f(x,u,\nabla u)$, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 123 (1993), 1-49.

[21] Fuchs, M.; Seregin, G.: Variational methods for problems from plasticity theory and for generalized Newtonian fluids. Ann. Univ. Sarav. Ser. Math. 10 (1999), no. 1, iv+283 pp.

[22] Giaquinta, M.; Modica, G.; Souček, J.: Functionals with linear growth in the calculus of variations. Comm. Math. Univ. Carolinae 20 (1979), 143–172.

[23] Goffman, C.; Serrin, J.: Sublinear functions of measures and variational integrals. Duke Math. J. 31 (1964), 159–178.

[24] Kirchheim, B.; Kristensen, J.: On Rank One Convex Functions that are Homogeneous of Degree One. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 221 (2016), no. 1, 527–558.

[25] Muckenhoupt, B.; Wheeden, R.: Weighted norm inequalities for fractional integrals. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 192 (1974), 261-274.

[26] Ornstein, D.: A non–equality for differential operators in the L^1–norm. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 11 1962 40–49.

[27] Reshetnyak, Yu. G.: Weak convergence of completely additive vector functions on a set. Siberian Mathematical Journal (1968), Volume 9, Issue 6, 1039-1045.
[28] Smith, K. T.: Formulas to represent functions by their derivatives. Math. Ann. 188 1970 53-77.
[29] Spector, D.: Simple proofs of some results of Reshetnyak. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 139 (2011), no. 5, 1681-1690.
[30] Stein, Elias M. Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy. Princeton Mathematical Series, 43. Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.
[31] Santi,E.: Sul problema al contorno per lequazione delle superfici di area minima su domini limitati qualunque, Ann. Univ. Ferrara, N. Ser., Sez. VII 17 (1972), 13–26.
[32] Strang, G.; Temam, R.: Functions of bounded deformation. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 75 (1980/81), no. 1, 7-21.
[33] Suquet, Pierre-Marie Sur un nouveau cadre fonctionnel pour les quations de la plasticit. (French) C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. A-B 286 (1978), no. 23, A1129-A1132.
[34] Tartar, L.: An Introduction to Sobolev Spaces and Interpolation Spaces. Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana, Vol. 18 (2007)
[35] Torchinsky, A.: Real-variable methods in harmonic analysis. Reprint of the 1986 original [Dover, New York; MR0869816]. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2004. xiv+462 pp.
[36] Van Schaftingen, J.: Limiting Sobolev Inequalities for Vector Fields and Cancelling Differential Operators, Jour. Euro. Math. Society, 2013.